

THE  
**Christian Examiner.**

---

---

No. III.]      *May and June, 1824.*      [VOL. I.

---

---

**Miscellany.**

NOTES UPON THE BIBLE.—No. III.

IN the two preceding numbers of these notes, I have given some historical account of the origin of that collection of writings, which constitute the New Testament, of the manner in which they were preserved in manuscript for more than fourteen centuries, of the circumstances under which the present received text was then formed and printed, and of some of the attempts, which have since been made to correct such errors, as farther researches have, in the course of three centuries, discovered in the copy, and to restore it to its primitive purity.

We have seen that but few manuscript copies were consulted, in forming the text as it was first printed ; nor had it the benefit of correction from the readings of any considerable number more, before it was considered as fixed, and to be regarded as a standard. But since that period, numerous manuscripts have come to light, some of very ancient date, and many of them of great value, for recovering a more correct reading of the text. Ancient versions also, which were either unknown, or inaccessible at that time, have furnished valuable contributions, either to confirm or to correct the text, and recourse has been had to quotations from the books of the New Testament, to be found in the writings of early Christians.

The use of all these researches has been to establish, on the most unquestionable ground, the general purity of the writings of the New Testament, and the general correctness of the received text; at the same time that they supply the means of restoring the true reading, wherever errors have crept in, and prove clearly that neither it, nor any other single existing copy, can be presumed to be wholly without fault.

Before the invention of printing, copies of books could be multiplied only by the slow and expensive process of writing; and of course every copy that was taken was liable to new errors in addition to those, which had crept into it at each preceding transcript. Now, in books transmitted down in this manner through fourteen centuries, (for so long it was from the time of the apostles to that in which they issued from the Complutum press,) the mistakes in transcribing may be expected to be numerous, and sometimes of some importance. Especially must this be the case in respect to writings, which had been often transcribed, in places far distant from each other, with different degrees of care, and sometimes by persons imperfectly, if at all, acquainted with the language in which they were written.

The variety thus found in the existing manuscripts of the New Testament, constitutes what is called *the various readings* of that book. They are distinguished from mere *errata* in this respect, that the *latter* are mistakes of the last transcriber in departing from the text before him; the *former* are errors, which he finds in the text, and transfers into the copy he is taking. The first departure, therefore, from the original text, is only an *erratum*, and becomes a *various reading* by being transferred to another copy, as a part of the text.\*

Properly speaking, a various reading is a departure from *the original text*; but, as we have not now the original text, with which to compare existing copies, we are under the ne-

\* The same principle holds, as to a departure from any succeeding copy after the original. The first deviation from that copy is an *erratum*. It becomes a *various reading*, when it is again transferred into another copy, as a part of the true text. Let A for example, be assumed as the original text. When the copy B is taken from it, the mistakes of the transcriber in copying are simply *errata*. They become *various readings*, when the copy C taken from B retains those errors as a part of the true text. But if the copy C varies from B in other places, where B was a true copy of the original, they are only *errata*; and they, in the same manner, become *various readings*, when copied again by D they are retained as making a part of the true text.



cessity of assuming some one copy as a standard, and *the received text* is adopted for this purpose, every deviation from which is called a various reading. It follows, that every various reading, as the phrase is used, is not of course a false reading. It is always a question to be decided by fair principles of criticism, whether, in any given instance, the copy, which we have assumed as a standard, or the variation from it, be the true reading. It *may* be, that the received text, and not the copy that we compare with it, is a deviation from the original reading.

All variations from the original text in succeeding copies may be referred either to *accident* or *design*. In the former class are comprehended all those, which are owing to the mere carelessness of the copyist, in varying from the text before him by the addition, omission, or change of letters, syllables, or words, or in mistaking the text, and thus copying it wrong; also those, which are occasioned by the incorrectness of the copy itself, which he is transcribing, on account of the mistakes introduced into it by a previous transcriber.

In the latter class are included alterations, which have been made intentionally by criticks for the purpose of improving the text, or of restoring it by conjecture, where it was supposed to have been corrupted before; also such alterations, as have been made to serve the designs of a party, introduced for the purpose of giving support to some favourite opinion, or to overthrow one that is offensive.

To this last cause very few of the various readings can with any probability be attributed; for very few of them are of such a nature, as to furnish any ground for suspecting that they were introduced without authority, either by the critick, in order to render the text more intelligible, or by the sectarian, to bend its meaning to the support of a favourite opinion. Readings of the kind above mentioned, affecting the evidence of some doctrine, or making a change in the sense of the passage where it stands, we have reason to believe, had usually a very innocent origin, being nothing more than the transfer of a marginal note by the transcriber into the body of the text.

It was customary for the owner of a manuscript to insert a word or a sentence in the margin of his copy, explanatory of a difficult passage, or expressing more fully or more clearly its meaning. This note a transcriber was not unlikely to mis-

take for a part of the text, which having been omitted in copying was afterwards placed in the margin, and which it was his duty to restore to its place in the text.

Upon this view of the various readings in the text of the New Testament, it becomes a question of deep interest to the Christian, in what degree its purity is affected by them. For if the alterations, to which time, carelessness, and fraud, have subjected these writings, are such as to render it impossible to ascertain, to any degree of certainty, what they originally were, on important points of fact or doctrine; it must be acknowledged, that their value, as a source of historical truth, and their certainty, as a rule of faith and manners, is destroyed, or at least so far impaired, as to weaken essentially our confidence in them.

But the appearance of uncertainty, so striking on a first view of the various readings, which meet the eye on almost every page of the New Testament, vanishes on a closer inspection; and all apprehension of their influence on the Christian faith or doctrine is removed, when we see of what kind they are. For, as to the great bulk of these varieties in the text, they make no alteration whatever in its sense. They are evidently the mere mistakes of transcribers, copied by succeeding transcribers, easy to be accounted for, and easily corrected. Some of them are such as to give a different sense to the passage in which they are found, and thus to render it difficult, perhaps sometimes impossible, to ascertain what was the meaning originally intended by the author; yet neither of the several readings, and neither of the senses in which the passage can be understood, having any relation to any important fact or doctrine of our religion. A few only, and they are *very few*, whether considered absolutely, or relatively to the whole number, are of such a nature as to excite much interest in ascertaining which is the true reading, on account of the influence, which either of the readings in question may have on the support of any article of Christian faith. And of *these last*, which are the only ones about which we can feel any concern, it is extremely important to observe, that *there is no doctrine or fact so wholly dependent on them, that it must be received or rejected, accordingly as one or the other reading of the text shall prevail.* Whatever reading be adopted in the cases in question, no new view will be presented of



the Christian doctrine, nor will the degree of evidence, by which any truth of our religion is supported, be materially changed.\*

Had the copies of the New Testament, which have come down to us, in their transmission through successive centuries, and versions from one language into another, suffered changes of such a nature, as to render it uncertain what were the facts and events originally narrated, what were the principles of the Christian institution, what were the real character and actions of its founder, and what the doctrine he promulgated; *then*, indeed, must we resign our confidence in the sacred text; for *then* would it be impossible to learn from it, with any degree of certainty, what Christianity originally was. Had there, on the other hand, been a perfect uniformity in all the manuscript copies, that have come down to us; were there *no* various readings, or were they *fewer*, or of a *different kind*; unless it were proved, that the sacred text had been preserved by miracle from the unvarying effects of time upon the text of every other book, how difficult would it be to account for this perfect uniformity in the several copies, consistently with the authenticity of the book! To what strong suspicion would it be liable of concert and management, in order to produce this uniformity, so contrary to all the laws, the operation of which is experienced in other writings!

But to neither of these objections, as to the purity of the text, are the writings of the New Testament exposed. The several copies differ from each other just as they might be expected to do, in the circumstances in which they have come down to us in manuscript through so many centuries; yet

\* It may be thought, perhaps, that the celebrated text, 1 John, v. 7. forms an exception to the last remark, as being *the only text in the Bible, that expresses distinctly the great doctrine of a trinity of persons in the unity of the Deity*; so that the doctrine itself rests wholly upon the genuineness of that single text. This would indeed be a real exception, were it a fact, that the doctrine itself is expressed distinctly in that text. But this is not the case. Were the genuineness of the text admitted, all that is proved is, that *there are three witnesses in heaven, that agree in the same testimony*. But there is no intimation of any other kind of unity. On the contrary, there is a strong positive implication that there is not. It is the *testimony only* that is *one*. The *witnesses* are expressly declared to be *three*. The text therefore expresses no doctrine or sentiment that is peculiar to it, and none that gives any support to the popular doctrine of the Trinity. Certainly it can with no pretence be said to express distinctly the doctrine of a trinity of persons in the unity of the Deity.

This is said, not from the apprehension, that there is the smallest ground for believing the text to be genuine. There was probably never a question of biblical criticism more completely settled, than that, which relates to the authority of this text, and which has issued in the establishment of its spuriousness.



numerous as their minute and unimportant differences are, their general agreement is of the most satisfactory kind. For, as we have before stated, each and every copy contains the same rule of life, gives us the same course of history, refers to the same prophecies, relates the same miracles, and establishes the same institution.

Is there a copy of the Christian Scriptures in any language, from which the honest inquirer would draw a different system of faith and duty, or a different representation of the divine character and government from that, which he finds in the copy before him; or one in which he might not find the whole system of Christian history, doctrine, and morals? Is there a copy from which a single article of our faith, important to be known, believed, or practised, is absent? It belongs to him, who would weaken your confidence in the sacred writings by suspicions of their corruption, to produce one; to show, that the alterations, which the text has undergone, are such, and the varieties in the different copies of such a nature, as to render our faith, and duty, and hopes, uncertain. Until this is done, we have a right to regard the authority of the Christian Scriptures, and the purity of the text, as firmly established; so that the various readings discovered in the different copies are no reasonable ground of perplexity or alarm, since they furnish no just cause of triumph to the enemy of our faith.

But this is not all that may be said. The various readings, of which we are speaking, are not merely harmless. They serve at once the purpose of ascertaining to us the extent, to which the text has suffered by the hand of time, and of furnishing the means of repairing the injury. Their existence and their publicity show, that these books have passed down the current of time subject to the same casualties, as other ancient writings, and accordingly liable to no peculiar suspicion of having been tampered with by their friends, for the purpose of concealing or disguising their real state. While, therefore, they confessedly furnish proof of *change*, or if you please, *corruption* of the original text to a certain degree, they supply also the means of correcting errors in the received text, and of restoring it to its primitive purity. To this use they have been successfully applied, and to this use they are to be still farther applied.

Since the printing of the Greek text of the New Testa-

ment, in the sixteenth century, manuscripts of great antiquity, and some of them of great value, have come to light; and together with them also ancient versions, which were at that time but little known; or inaccessible. In these manuscripts and versions, and in quotations from the Scriptures in the writings of the early Fathers, are found the *various readings*, which the industry of biblical scholars has collected together, and which, at first view, present so formidable an aspect on the margin of every page of the corrected text of Griesbach. It was by the help of these, that a work so desirable to the Christian world was achieved by that indefatigable scholar; that of rescuing the text of the New Testament from those faults, by which the Christian, though his religious views and his system of faith were not essentially affected, often found his understanding perplexed, and his taste offended, and sometimes even his judgment misled.

Of these manuscripts, according to Marsh the learned translator of Michaelis, more than 450 have actually been examined either wholly or in part; and this number makes but a small part of those, which are yet to be drawn forth, if their testimony should be required, either in support of the text, or for its correction. No less than 355 manuscripts were consulted in forming the corrected text of Griesbach. It is however to be observed, that very few of these were complete copies of the whole New Testament. Most of the manuscripts contain only the four Gospels, some of them only the Acts and the Catholick Epistles; others these last together with the Epistles of Paul; a *few* only contain the Apocalypse; and many are defective, having lost by time, or use, or want of care in their preservation, several parts, which originally belonged to them; and some consist only of a few fragments.\*

\* This incompleteness of ancient manuscripts is a fact of some importance. The ignorance of it has sometimes led to mortifying mistakes; and a presumption of the ignorance of others has emboldened violent partizans to practice the most impudent imposition for the purpose of supporting a favourite doctrine. An instance of this is related by Wetstein of a French preacher in the Netherlands, who asserted in a public discourse, that the disputed text, 1 John, v. 7, relative to the three heavenly witnesses, was contained in the Codex Cantabrigiensis, whereas *the epistle itself is not in that copy*. The manuscript consists only of the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles.

He mentions also another instance of a similar kind. It was asserted by a writer of some character, that the doxology to the Lord's prayer, which in the received text is found in the 6th chapter of Matthew, was contained in the Alexandrine manuscript, whereas the fact is, that *the chapter itself is not there*. It is well known that the twenty four first chapters of Matthew are missing from that copy.



There are three circumstances of difference, by which the relative value of manuscripts, for the purpose of ascertaining the purity of the text, or for correcting it, may be estimated.

1st. They are, in the first place, to be distinguished by the materials upon which they are written.

The most ancient copies are on vellum. The only exception is that of a copy of the Gospel of Mark at Venice, written on the Egyptian papyrus, which is believed to be of great antiquity. But how far it makes an exception is uncertain, as its exact age is not known.

Those written on the *charta bombycina*, a kind of cotton paper, are of considerable antiquity. But these cannot be referred to a period earlier than the ninth century. By far the greatest number of manuscripts are written upon common paper, and are known from that circumstance alone to be of modern date. They were chiefly written, says Wetstein, in Italy, as late as the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and can none of them belong to a period earlier than the thirteenth.

2d. A second important distinction in manuscripts relates to the *character* in which they are written.

The most ancient are written wholly in what are called *Uncial* or capital Letters. They are without accents or aspirates, and for the most part without any distinction of words. Whole sentences in succession are written in a continuous manner, without intervals of space between any of the letters, to designate the words of which the passage consists. The oldest of them now extant are supposed by some to have been written as early as the fourth century. By others their date is fixed to the fifth or sixth. The character, in which the most ancient are written, is perfectly simple and unadorned, resembling the inscriptions, which are found on the most ancient Grecian monuments. Of this description are the Alexandrine and Cambridge manuscripts, very excellent copies of which are to be seen in the library of Harvard College.

Those which were written as late as the ninth century appear in a character more rude, and at the same time far more ornamented; partaking very clearly, as is observed, of the taste of a semibarbarous age. By this circumstance critics are enabled to determine, with a considerable degree of confidence, the age of copies, falling between those periods, by the degree in which they approach, on the one hand, to the



simplicity of the former, or, on the other hand, to the rudeness and cumbrous ornament of the latter.

Those copies, which appear in the small Greek letter, are comparatively modern. The tenth century is the highest antiquity, to which the oldest of them can have any claim.

3d. For the purpose of estimating the relative value of manuscripts, they have again been reduced to several classes, according to the countries from which they were brought. They are traced to four *families* or *editions*, from some one of which each of the copies, which have yet been discovered, is supposed to have sprung.

There was, in the first place, the western edition, consisting of those copies, which were used in countries, where the Latin language was spoken. It coincides with the Latin version, which was probably made from it; and its agreement with the more ancient Latin version is said to be still closer, than with the present text of the Vulgate. It corresponds also, as might be expected, with the quotations in the Latin Fathers.

There was, in the next place, the Alexandrine edition, which was the copy used in Egypt, and from which was made the version into the *Coptic*, or language of Lower Egypt, and probably also into the *Sahidic*, or the language spoken in Upper Egypt. With this text the quotations in the writings of Origen, Cyril, and other divines of the Alexandrine school, are found also to agree.

There was, in the third place, what is called the Edessene edition, chiefly important as the parent of the ancient Syriac version. We have no certainty that any copy of this edition is now in being. It is however stated, as a remarkable fact, that although the version mentioned above has so completely taken place of the original in the East, where it was made, that the original itself has disappeared; yet Greek copies have been found in the *West of Europe*, which coincide so closely with the Syriac version, that, however difficult it may be to account for the fact, there can be little doubt, that they belong to the same edition, and were derived from the same copy, from which that version was made. How they came into Europe or when is not known.

In the last place is mentioned the Byzantine edition, which was the copy used at Constantinople, the capital of the East-

ern empire. As this was the edition used where the Greek language was spoken, there are many more copies of this edition, than of all the others together. To this edition are to be referred the quotations of Chrysostom, and those of Theophylact, bishop of Bulgaria, as also the Slavonian or Russian version. And it is finally to be regarded as the basis of our received text, which is often found to agree with this, where it varies from the readings of the other editions.

---

TRANSIENT GOODNESS.

THE picture, which the pen of inspiration has drawn of transient virtue, as resembling 'the morning cloud and the early dew,' is, we fear, a just picture of the goodness of a large proportion of every Christian community. Of this kind of virtue, we may say, that it blossoms but bears no fruit. It holds out promises, which it does not perform. It is fair in appearance, but it wants reality and substance. When men commence a course of religion, and do not persevere; when they resolve, but fail to execute; when they are unfaithful to their own purposes and convictions; when their zeal is chilled to indifference, and charity waxes cold, and devotion languishes; when the world with its cares, and pleasure with its allurements; when riches in their deceitfulness, or the lust of other things come and take possession, where religion was preparing itself an abode, then is their 'goodness like the morning cloud and the early dew.'

But to form right views of this short lived virtue, we must distinguish it carefully from hypocrisy, the characteristick of which is, that it assumes the garb of religion without any feeling of its power. The character, here intended, is sincere as far as it goes. It really means what it proposes at the time; and we see, at once, its origin and its danger, in that it yields itself without consideration to the impulse of feeling, and mistakes a passing emotion for the strength and consistency of mature resolution. Peter was not a hypocrite, when he resolved before his Lord, 'Though I die with thee, yet will I not deny thee.' It was the ardour of his heart, uttering itself

in promises, which a better self-acquaintance would have taught him, he might not be able to perform. And in this fervour of mind, combined with the corrupting influences of the world and the spirit of self-deceit, is to be found a fruitful source of the inconstancy here designed.

It is therefore the character, not of hypocrites, who put on the mask of religion to hide their villany, or to accomplish some worldly purpose ; not of unbelievers, who refuse to religion so much as the tribute of their speculative assent ; not of the insensible, who are proof against the admonitions of conscience and the calls of the Gospel ; not of the abandoned, who have sold themselves to commit all iniquity with greediness, but of a class, which forms, it is to be feared, a large proportion in every Christian community ; of those, who resolve and wish, and do not accomplish ; who find a certain charm and loveliness in religion, and for a time pursue it ; but whom the world solicits, and the solicitation is granted ; and who, notwithstanding certain degrees of love to God, certain desires after holiness, and some partial attainments in virtue, are always giving themselves reason to mourn their deviations, and are always to be found among the wavering and unsteady disciples. ‘I know thy works,’ said the spirit of God to the Church of Ephesus, graciously commending at the same time what virtue they possessed, ‘I know thy works, and that for my sake thou hast believed ; nevertheless I have somewhat against thee, that thou hast forsaken thy first love. Remember from what thou hast fallen, and do thy first works.’

If we inquire into the sources of this inconsistency, we should find them partly in the superficial views entertained of the nature and obligations of religion itself ; partly in an ardour of mind, which in the eagerness of resolution overlooks the difficulty of performance, and in our early sanguine expectations as to the efficacy of the ordinances of religion, and of the special providences of God.

A fruitful source of danger upon this subject is undoubtedly to be found in superficial views of religion itself. The foundation of consistent practice must be lain in deeply established principle ; and this principle is the fruit of serious and mature reflection ; reflection on the great truths, duties, and alternatives of religion. A man, who thinks only occasionally or carelessly of what he owes to God, and to his own soul,



will not, in the hour of danger, find himself fortified against the solicitations of passion, or any outward temptation. Deep feeling and consistent practice in religion can be the result only of serious thought. The mind must be established by deliberate reflection on truth, to give to that truth its full efficacy upon the heart and life. Yet it will not be denied, that this is very different from the kind of reflection usually bestowed. Few men accustom themselves to think of religion, as involving all that is most precious to their souls; their present peace and their eternal salvation. For the most part they bestow upon it a transient thought; a divided or a superficial attention. Hence, as their minds are not occupied, their feelings are not enlisted; and as no man uniformly perseveres in that, to which his affections are not given, it need not surprise us, that so many, who begin well and endure for a season, as soon as a slight discouragement cometh, fall away.

There is also danger from that ardour of mind, generally found in the earlier and inexperienced periods of life, tempting to precipitate plans, and to extravagant expectations of the efficacy of the means and ordinances of religion, independantly of personal effort and prayer. It will at once be perceived, that we are not here intending that earnestness and engagedness of soul, without which nothing permanent in religion can be accomplished; but we refer to that ardour, which comes with a sanguine temperament, and depends for its continuance on periods and circumstances of life. In the season of youth, for example, before we have made trial of the world's temptations, or of our own weakness; when our feelings are fresh, and our hopes are buoyant, and we have not yet learnt caution from difficulty; or, in entering upon a new and important relation, domestick, professional, or in any way affecting the great interests of life, when the novelty of the change excites reflection, and its responsibleness awakens our solicitude, we lay down our plan, and fondly dream that we shall fulfil it. But with the excitements and the duties come also the discouragements; our resolution falters; the excitement has gone by; and a little time leaves us indolent, careless, and unfaithful. In like manner, under particular events of God's providence, designed to awaken us; when a languid frame reminds us of the uncertainty of our lives; or

straitened circumstances bring dejection to our spirits, or when death has torn from us the object of affection and hope ; when we are compelled to feel the emptiness of the world, and see with our own eyes, and realize in our own calamities what was before an empty speculation ; under these or similar circumstances of tenderness and fear, we go to God ; we resolve, that we will give up the vanities of the world, and find all our refuge and hope in the service of religion. But our sorrows have their temptations, as well as their admonitions ; the engagements and cares of life return upon us ; the spirituality, that adversity had been cherishing, wears away, and we are soon as selfish, and worldly, and insensible as before.

In our improvement also of the means of religion there is danger, lest the excitement of first impressions should subside ; and that the benefit derived from these be as transient and ineffectual as from the special providences of God. We approach, for example, for the first time to the table of the Lord. We are led thither perhaps by a calm, serious reflection, which possibly we may have long entertained, of the sacredness and obligation of this ordinance ; or perhaps we have been more immediately persuaded by the perusal of a book, by the conversation of a pious friend, by the influence, as before, of some affecting providence of God. We come in the spirit of Christian hope, with an earnestness of resolution, and, we will suppose, with a sincere and humble piety, which God accepts. Our best affections, our holiest desires are engaged ; and we fondly trust, that this act of our faith and gratitude may prove to us the commencement of a new life. But we must take heed, lest we mistake the freshness and ardour of devout feeling for the state of a confirmed Christian ; and lest we depend on an outward ordinance, as a means of improvement, to accomplish that for us, which can be the fruit only of personal effort, habitual circumspection, and earnest prayer.

There is, indeed, the greatest reason to distrust all excitement in religion, that is not sustained by deliberate reflection, both of the supreme importance of the subject, and of the obstacles, which, from our tempers, our condition, or from whatever circumstances, may be opposed to us. As in every important concern of life, it is the dictate of wisdom to sit down and count the cost, so in this especially, in comparison with which the highest earthly objects lose all their interest,

we must deliberately fortify ourselves with the whole armour of God. Mere feeling, that is not founded in conviction, is not to be trusted. By its nature it is fallacious, and generally it will be found, that in proportion as it approaches to ecstasy and transport, it is short lived and unprofitable. Nay, there is danger, lest in the exhaustion of the soul, and in the disgust, which, when the impulse has gone, we may feel at our own extravagance, we may become indifferent and insensible.

Our observation of the sources of inconstant virtue may at the same time show to us its evil. It is doing superficially, and for a season, what should be the settled business of our lives. It is bringing a doubtful, transient passion to a service, which demands the continued exercise of our noblest powers and of our purest affections. It is trifling with the most serious of all concerns. It supposes a course, and implies a character, which can never approve itself to our judgment; for it must be evident to the least reflection, that if religion demands any thing, it demands all; that on the same grounds, that it claims a part, it is entitled to the service of our whole lives. It is utterly unprofitable; for with such wavering, short lived virtue, we are perpetually losing the little we may have gained. It is above all displeasing to God, for it involves unfaithfulness to our covenant; it is the forsaking of him, who is the fountain of living waters, and the hewing out to ourselves of broken cisterns, that can hold no water. It is, therefore, ruinous to our hopes of salvation; for it is only in patient continuance in well doing, that we can attain eternal life.

It is obvious, therefore, that if we would possess a virtue consistent and enduring, we must lay its foundations broad and deep, in just convictions of the nature of religion itself; remembering, that it is not a transport, an occasional effort, but a principle, designed to pervade, elevate, and sanctify our souls; that it calls us to the service of a God, who holds a perfect claim to the service of our whole lives, and who, whatever may be our fickleness, changes not either in the perfections of his nature, or in the requirements of his law; that as the duties of religion cannot be fulfilled, nor its spirit acquired, so neither can its comforts or its hopes be realized, but in a course of resolute and unwavering obedience. We shall also guard against the danger, to which we have adverted, of making our religious feelings to depend upon particular occur-



rences, or outward ordinances. For while we should earnestly endeavour to accept and improve these, as the instruments of holiness, we should strive that the religious principle be so established within us, that our piety may not languish, even in the absence of all these; and that whatever may be the outward circumstances of our lives, whether we are prosperous or afflicted; among Christian friends in the temple, where sympathy alone may kindle up our devotion, or in the solitary chamber, where there is none to witness but God; in our native home, where the Sabbath returns to us with its enlivening privileges, or in the wide deep, where there is no altar but the altar of the heart, our faith may still be strong, and the love of God may still purify and rejoice our souls. We do not mean that we have equal advantages for the maintenance of the religious character in the privation as in the enjoyment of these outward privileges; but that, if we would maintain a consistent virtue *it must not depend on these*; and that we should be equally faithful to our principles and duties amidst the common circumstances of life, as in the immediate services of religion, or under the excitements of some special providence. We must indeed feel, and feel deeply, the power of God's truth, the solemnity of our destiny, and whatever affects the interests of our immortal souls. But we must 'be jealous' over our stronger emotions 'with a godly jealousy,' lest they be fruitless and unavailing; lest they pass away with the occasion that excited them, and only leave us to the shame and folly of trifling with our own souls; of swelling the account, which we must render, of resolutions we have broken, of the movings of God's Spirit within us, we have quenched, and of opportunities of grace, enjoyed only to be abused.

---

EXTRACTS FROM A NOTE BOOK.

*Sacrifice.\**

\* WHAT was there, in all the Jewish sacrifices, especially in those, which more eminently typified the sacrifice of Christ, from which we may learn the proper efficacy, and the true

\* Continued from page 114.

nature and design, of *his sacrifice*? These are discovered, principally, in two things. The first is, that the efficacy of all the victims, properly, had *respect to God*. The second is, that *vicarious punishment was inflicted on the piacular victims*. The first of these things indicates, that the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice primarily, and properly, had respect, *not to men, but to God*. The second teaches us, that *Christ suffered a vicarious punishment for our sins.*'—*Outram on Sacrifices*, p. 229.

NOTE. The question arises, and it is very important, were the piacular sacrifices of the Mosaick law instituted, because sacrifice, or an offering of blood for sin, was *in itself necessary*, or, was their institution merely *an incidental part of the Jewish economy*? If they were instituted for the very end of being typical of the sacrifice to be made by our Lord Jesus Christ, we may then carefully seek for correspondences between the type and the antitype. But let us still beware that we be not wise above what is written. The Mosaick law appointed no atonement for those sins, by which life was forfeited. And, not only are atonements required by it, where the severest casuist would not impute guilt; but they were made as well without, as with blood. 'Nor was the atonement ever made by the death of the animal, but by the sprinkling of the blood afterwards. It was made by the priest, whose office did not begin, till after the victim was slain by the person who brought it. The sons of Aaron then made the atonement, by sprinkling the blood about the altar, or by pouring it at the bottom of it.' Even, therefore, in this view of sacrifices, the doctrine is a mere assumption, that *vicarious punishment was inflicted on the piacular victims*.

But if the doctrine be admitted, that sacrifices would not have been appointed to the Israelites, but from the circumstance, that having been accustomed to this mode of worship, and being strongly attached to it, they were not prepared to maintain a more purely spiritual service, there is then good ground to suppose, that what is said of the sacrifice of our Lord, is wholly figurative language, and employed in accommodation to Jewish conceptions. No one supposes that our Lord was literally our *ransom*; or, that we are literally *bought* by the blood of Christ. Nor would his death, probably, have been represented as *a sacrifice*, but from the circumstance, that this term conveyed more forcibly, than any other could

have conveyed, to a Jewish mind, the idea, that as our Lord Jesus Christ died in the cause, and for the end, of delivering men from sin, and of bringing them to holiness and to God,—the end for which not only sacrifice, but the whole law was designed,—so every one who hopes to be a partaker of the benefits of his death, must live in conformity with the design of it. If sacrifice was but an incidental part of the Jewish system, and the whole efficacy of it depended upon the disposition of the offerer, there is then some hazard of being led into error, by following out too closely the analogy between our Lord's death, and the sacrificial law. The allusions to our Lord's death as *a sacrifice*, if this view of sacrifice be a correct one, are then made on the principle of accommodation; as citations are repeatedly made from the Old Testament, by the evangelists, and applied to our Lord, which it is now generally acknowledged, had no reference to him, in their original application. Very remarkable are the words of God in Hosea, vi. 6. *I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings.* But important as is the sentiment, in the connexion in which the prophet has adduced it, it obtains additional, and greatly interesting illustration, from the associations into which it is brought in the teaching of our Saviour. Matthew has recorded two instances of its application by our Lord, in a manner which indicates, that he would make it a proverb among his disciples; and in circumstances which give to it a peculiar distinctness, and force of meaning. In the first place, in the seventh chapter of his Gospel, we are told that Jesus, being at table in a house, many publicans and sinners came, and sat down with him and his disciples. Some *Pharisees*, observing this, said to these disciples, "why does your master eat with publicans and sinners?" Jesus, hearing them, answered, "the whole need not a physician, but the sick. *Go, therefore, and learn what this meaneth, I DESIRE MERCY, AND NOT SACRIFICE; for I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.*" In other words, go, therefore, and learn the meaning of those words of God, of the true import of which ye yet seem to be so utterly ignorant, *I desire mercy, and not sacrifice.* Go, and learn from them, *that pity for these sinners, whom you despise, and your solicitude and endeavours for their reformation, would be far more acceptable to God, than are all your burnt*



*offerings.* Go, and learn, that *the exercise of justice, and of compassion, will bring you nearer to God and to heaven, than all your holocausts.* And, again, in the twelfth chapter, we are told, that some of the disciples of Jesus, on the sabbath, being hungry, began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat them. The *Pharisees*, therefore, accuse them to Jesus, of having broken the sabbath. In justification of his followers, he adduces the example of David, when he was hungry; and of the priests, while in the service of the temple on the sabbath. He appealed, also, to the sanction which he had himself given to their conduct. *I say unto you, that in this place is one greater than the temple.* And then immediately adds, “but had ye known what this meaneth, *I will have mercy, and not sacrifice*, ye would not have condemned the guiltless.” How impressively did he thus inculcate the sentiment, that *justice, sympathy, kindness*, are in the sight of God of far greater worth, than the blood of thousands of rams, or than ten thousand rivers of oil? If, then, it had been the final design of the Jewish sacrifices, to typify a great atoning sacrifice, that was to be made by the Messiah, would our Lord, in this manner, have spoken of sacrifices? I think not. Or, had this been the design of the Jewish sacrifices, would he not repeatedly, and explicitly, have referred to this purpose of their appointment? And who can shew us such a reference to them, in all the teaching of Jesus?

‘A remarkable use of the term *sacrifice* occurs in the first epistle to the Corinthians. *Christ, our passover, is sacrificed for us.\** But, is the pascal victim to be numbered among the proper sacrifices? Above all, is there a circumstance of it, that can give to it the character of an *expiatory offering*? We are told, indeed, that in the passover that was kept by Josiah, *the priests sprinkled the blood of the lamb.†* But in the institution of this rite, God did not require that the blood of the lamb should be sprinkled by the priests.‡ The ordinance was designed alone to be commemorative of God’s mercy, in sparing, or passing over the children of the Israelites, when he slew the first born of the Egyptians. In reference, therefore, to the commemorative feast of the Lord’s Supper, which was instituted on the night in which he had eaten the

\* 1 Cor. v. 7.

† 2 Chron. xxxv. 11.

‡ See Exod. xii.

passover with his disciples, Paul calls *Christ, our Passover*. It was a most natural association of ideas in his mind. And I suppose that he considered our Lord to be a *sacrifice for us*, in quite as strict a sense, as he considered the pascal lamb to be a sacrifice for those who partook of it. But surely the apostle never thought of the *pascal lamb as an expiatory offering*.

‘Prayers are a species of sacrifices, and sacrifices a species of prayers. Prayers are spiritual sacrifices, and sacrifices are symbolical prayers. Whoever considers the efficacy of the one as having respect to God, ought to maintain the same opinion of the efficacy of the other.’ *Ib.* p. 242.

NOTE. Prayers have *respect to God*. How? Is it meant that God is *induced* by prayers to do that, which, without prayer, he would not be *disposed* to do for us? I have no doubt whether God does that, in answer to prayer, which he would not otherwise have done; because I have no doubt whether it be the tendency, and the effect, of sincere prayer, to qualify us for the reception of blessings, which we should not otherwise be in a moral condition to receive. Nay, more. Not only does not the immutability of God stand as an objection in my mind against the doctrine, that he hears and answers prayer, but the very fact of his unchangeableness is a ground of my conviction, that, as the moral Governour of the world, he must distinguish between those who disregard him, and those who worship him in spirit and in truth. But this is very distinct from the sentiment, that God is *induced* by prayer, or by the death of our Lord, to do, what he would not otherwise have done, for man. It is indeed a doctrine of Calvinism, that inflexible justice required the blood, either of the offender, or of a substitute, in expiation of the guilt of the violated law; that by nothing short of this, could God have secured the honour of his law. The only worthy victim in the universe, however, was the holy Jesus. On him, therefore, God poured out the fulness of his wrath; and, being thus *appeased* was *induced to forgive*. He is *induced* also, *for Christ’s sake*, to avert his anger in answer to the prayers of the elect, for whom Christ died. This, I repeat, is Calvinism. But how unlike the doctrine of the Gospel!

Compare this exposition of the design of our Lord’s death, with the testimony of Isaiah concerning God’s dispositions towards man. *Thus saith the Lord, the King of Israel and*

towards man. *Thus saith the Lord, the King of Israel and his redeemer, the Lord of hosts ; I am he that BLOTTETH OUT THINE INIQUITIES FOR MINE OWN SAKE, and will not remember thy sins.\* And again, to what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me, saith the Lord ? I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats. Bring no more vain oblations. Incense is an abomination to me. Your new moons, and your appointed feasts, my soul hateth. They are a trouble unto me. I am weary to bear them. Wash you, make you clean. Put away the evil of your doing from before mine eyes. Cease to do evil. Learn to do well. Seek judgment. Relieve the oppressed. Judge the fatherless. Plead for the widow. Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord. Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall then be white as snow ; and though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.†* Can it be then, that sacrifices, or prayers, primarily have respect to God, in the sense, that they induce him to be merciful ? Suppose sacrifice to have been permitted by God, because the Israelites, when they came from Egypt, were not qualified for a more spiritual worship, and we can at once account for the acceptance of it, when it was offered with the dispositions, and for the ends, professed by the offerer ; and for the utter rejection of it, when it was unattended with these dispositions. But, if it had been appointed *for its own sake*, or because it was, *in itself, expiatory*, it might have availed to its end, without these dispositions in the offerer. Calvinism is indeed so far consistent with itself, that it supposes God to be induced, by the death of Christ, to forgive the elect, without regard to any moral influence exerted upon them by his death. But whether this sentiment obtains any sanction from the design of the Jewish sacrifices, and the circumstances under which their offerers were accepted, judge ye.

That there is a connexion, and a most important connexion, between our Lord's death, and the forgiveness of the sins of those who believe in him, is to my mind one of the clearest doctrines of the New Testament. The great question on this subject, however, respects *the manner* in which his death becomes a means to us of forgiveness, and of acceptance with God. And, most important in their bearing

\* Chapter xlv. 6.

† Chapter l. 11—18.



upon this question are the *facts* ; first, that the mission and the death of our Lord are uniformly ascribed, in the New Testament, to *the antecedent love of God*. It was because *God so loved the world*, that he sent his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him may not perish, but have everlasting life. Secondly. We are most expressly told, that God sent his son *to bless us, by turning us from our iniquities* ; that *Christ died for us, that they which live, might not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him that died for us, and rose again* ; that he died *to redeem, or to deliver us from all iniquity, and to purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works*. And, thirdly, we are explicitly taught, that every one will at last *receive according to what he hath done in the body, whether it have been good, or whether it have been evil*. To my apprehension, then, it seems most plainly to be the doctrine of the New Testament, concerning the manner in which forgiveness is obtained for us through the death of our Lord, that in his death we have the strongest possible expression of God's love towards us, as sinners ; the strongest, and most affecting evidence, and assurance of mercy to the penitent, the reformed sinner ; and, consequently, the strongest and most affecting inducements, which can be addressed to accountable beings, to bring them to repentance, when they have sinned, and to the most unre-served devotion of their hearts to every Christian duty. That our Lord's death in no other way conduces to the forgiveness of sins, I say not. But I am sure that, in this view of it, it claims all the gratitude and obedience of which we are capable. And to me it seems to be wiser, to rely on what we are explicitly taught, than on any deductions, however plausible they may be, which are made from remote analogies, and from questionable premises.

For Outram's *proofs*, that the efficacy of all the Jewish sacrifices primarily and properly had respect to God, we refer the reader to page 231, et sequentes. We intended, with some care, to have examined these proofs. But unwilling farther to extend our notes upon sacrifice, we will close them with a few sensible, and very pertinent observations of Dr. Graves upon the subject.

' Under the Levitical law, reconciliation could be obtained only by repentance ; and no repentance was accepted, which did not prove its sincerity by practical reformation. For

Where the transgression was of a mere ritual precept, and committed without deliberation or design ; when discovered, the trespass offering was sufficient alone ; *for this showed that the offender acknowledged the authority of the law, which he had unintentionally violated.* But where the transgression included any encroachment on the rights of another, the trespass offering could not be received, unless it was accompanied by a public acknowledgment of the offence, a resignation of the usurped property, and a restitution to the person injured, if he or his heir could be found. If not, the usurped property was to be consecrated to pious uses, as the offender could not procure pardon while he retained it. No regulation could point out more clearly, *the inefficacy of sacrifice, where guilt was not unfeignedly repented of, and all the advantages that had tempted to its perpetration, renounced and resigned ; and where full restitution to the injured individual did not accompany humiliation before God.*

---

ON THE CAUSES BY WHICH UNITARIANS HAVE BEEN WITHHELD  
FROM EXERTIONS IN THE CAUSE OF FOREIGN MISSIONS.

[The following Sermon was preached at the Weekly Lecture, in the First Church, on the 20th of May, 1824. At the request of several of the audience the author has consented to furnish it for publication, in our work.]

MARK, XVI. 15.

*Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.*

It will not be forgotten by those, who were at the last Thursday Lecture, that the subject on which we were addressed was, *the sympathy which Christians should feel with each other.* We were told, that this sympathy should be as active as are our strongest affections, and as expansive as was the very love of Jesus ; that it should spread itself through all the communities of the Christian world, and comprehend every interest which belongs to the objects of our religion. We were referred to the capacity, and to the tendency, of the human mind, thus to extend itself to the concerns of others ;

to the concerns of those, who are most distant from us. We were told of the power, with which mind acts upon mind ; of the power of a character, exalted above all that belongs to sectarianism, and yet to be found in all the sects of Christendom, not alone to command the highest respect and affection for the individual possessing it, but to enlarge, and to liberalize the sentiments and feelings, it may be of many thousands, towards those from whom they differ most widely on the doctrines of Christianity. I suppose that no heart was untouched by the appeal that was then made to it. We all felt our affections drawn out towards all, of every name, and of every creed, in whose temper and life have been, or are, manifested the spirit of the religion of Christ. We felt that the Church of Christ, differing as it does in modes of faith, and in forms of worship, is yet essentially *one* in the principles, by which true sanctity of heart and character are formed ; and in the love excited of this character, we felt the principle of spiritual union with the whole body of Christ. I wish this morning to call your attention to a connected, but not less important subject ; I mean, *the duty of Christians to extend their sympathy to the heathen world* ; to extend to the heathen world that strong feeling of sympathy with their conditions and wants, and to cherish that strong interest in the cause of their improvement and happiness, which is as essentially a Christian sentiment, as is even love of the church of Christ. To be more definite, I wish to call your attention to the duty of *Unitarians*, to enlarge their sympathies to the extent of human wants ; to the extent of the ignorance, the moral degradation, and the miseries of heathenism. I might say, to the duty of Unitarians, in this great concern, to emulate the spirit of the age in which we live ; or at least, to sympathize with this spirit. But, I will rather say, to sympathize with the spirit of the age, in this exercise of the spirit of our religion. The subject is indeed too large, for a full discussion of it in a lecture ; and I will therefore but glance at some of the causes, by which Unitarians have been withheld from the exertions, to which, as I think, we are now called, in the service of extending the blessings of Christianity to the heathen. Let us then, as dispassionately as we can, review the circumstances by which we have been restrained from cooperation with the rest of the Christian world, in this



great work ; and open our hearts to the excitements which we have to the duty, of doing what we can, to bring *every knee to bow in the name of Jesus, and every tongue to confess that he is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.*

*The causes by which Unitarians have been withheld from exertions in the cause of foreign missions, what are they ?—*

I answer, *in the first place*, that one cause, and not the least influential, is, that *we think the heathen to be safe, as far as respects the future world, even while they are unenlightened by Christianity.* Or, in other words, we think that every individual will be required to have lived, according to the light which he has received, or has had opportunity of receiving ; and that God is, and will be, no respecter of persons. We therefore think, that as many as have *sinned* without a revealed law, by violating the unwritten law of their own hearts, will be punished, without being judged by a revealed law ; and, as many as have *sinned* under the light of revelation, will be judged by that revealed will of God which they have violated, and receive proportionally greater condemnation. We think, that when the Gentiles, who have not a revealed law, do by nature the things of the law, these, not having a revealed law, are a law to themselves ; and that, if they are good, according to their means and opportunities of goodness, God will accept them, as he accepted that Centurion, whose prayers and whose alms, we are told, while yet he was unconverted to the faith of Christ, went up for a memorial before him.\* These sentiments respecting the heathen world, are, we think, at once scriptural and rational. But, is it therefore to be inferred, that we have nothing to do in the cause of the extension of our religion to the Heathens ?

When I so state our prevailing thoughts and feelings, in regard to the final state of those who live and die Heathens, I do not mean to imply, that we have thus reasoned ourselves into a conviction, that nothing is to be done by us for their conversion to Christianity. But no one, I think, will doubt whether our sentiments on this subject, brought into collision, as they have been, with directly opposite sentiments,—with sentiments, with which we could feel no sympathy,—have

\* Romans, ii. and Acts, x.

exerted a very considerable power, in withholding our sympathies also from the ignorance, and the miseries of heathenism. No one will doubt, whether these views of the Heathen world have made us but too thoughtless, and too insensible of our solemn obligation to do what we may, to bring them to the knowledge of Christ, and to extend to them the blessings of his religion. Is it so? Let us then awake to the consideration, that the virtuous Heathen in the time of Christ, and in all preceding time, were as safe, as far as respects the future world, as they have been since, or as they now are. God never did require of any one, that he should be better than he could be; that he should improve more means than he possessed; nor did he ever account one to be guilty, who had done what he did not know, and had not the means of knowing, was wrong. Suppose then, that our Lord and his Apostles had acted upon the principle, that the virtuous Heathen are safe; that the virtuous Jew will not finally fail of acceptance; that God will require of men, only in proportion to what he has given; and therefore, that no exertions and sacrifices were demanded for the conversion of the Jews, or of Heathens, to a better faith. What, in this case, have we reason to think, would have been our own moral state at this time? I fear not that any well informed and fair mind will say, that either the moral, or the intellectual state of what we call christendom, would have been what it is, or as good as it is, without Christianity. I fear not that any one, who has any strong feeling of the blessings of Christianity, will not acknowledge, that they are incomparably the richest and the best, which God in his mercy has imparted to mankind.

The zeal that has been awakened and excited, in the cause of foreign missions, has, without doubt, obtained much excitement from the sentiment, that the Heathens, merely from the circumstance that they are Heathens, are under the wrath and curse of God; that, unless they are converted to Christianity, they will be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord,—with everlasting misery in Hell. This sentiment has been urged with every variety of expression, which can give it any new power upon the hearts of those who receive it. It is not only preached, but it is printed, and most industriously circulated, that it may constantly be under the eye, and every where act upon the sensibility, of those who

receive it. We shrink from this sentiment ; and it has, perhaps, contributed as much to our inertness in the cause of missions, as it has to the activity in the service of those who maintain it. If, indeed, this sentiment be true, if it be Christian, it is a matter of overwhelming surprise, that so very little is done by those, who profess to receive it, compared with what it is then most obviously their duty to do. What a dreadful account has that man to render to God, who believes that hundreds of thousands of Heathens are every hour thronging the gates of death, and passing down to everlasting torment, merely because they have been Heathens, and could not help it ; merely because they have not believed in Christ, though they have never heard of him ; and who yet withholds from the missionary service, even a fraction of all that he can spare from the interest, or from the earnings on which he depends to clothe, and to feed his family ? What a dreadful account has that rich man to render to God, who, believing this sentiment, and having himself alone the means of supporting many missionaries, is yet suffering tens of thousands and millions to perish for lack of that word of life, which he might but will not extend to them ! O how pitiable is the condition of that rich man, who so believes, and yet lives in a palace, surrounded by sumptuous furniture, and daily indulging in expensive luxuries ; who rides in his coach, maintains servants to obey him, and sleeps on a bed of down ! But so have we not learned the purposes of God, in the revelation which he has made to us of his will and his designs, by his Son. And, I believe the truth to be, in regard to this sentiment, that much as is done to extend, and to give it influence, it is yet cordially received by comparatively a small number ; who themselves receive it, only because they *must*, in order to be faithful to their system ; and who have again and again felt misgivings of heart, when they have written, or have preached it. It is such a palpable contradiction of every Christian idea of the character, government, and designs of God, and of the whole spirit of the Gospel, that it is only the mind that is manacled, and fettered by a system, that can be restrained in its views of God, or in its charity to man, within the narrow limits, which this sentiment prescribes to those who receive it. Are there then no other, and better grounds, on which to establish the duty ? Are there no other avenues to the con-



science, of which Unitarians may avail themselves, to press home the obligations of effort and sacrifice, in the cause of the universal diffusion of our religion?

Let us, Brethren, bring before our minds, as distinctly as we can, the actual blessings for which we are indebted to Christianity. Let us conceive strongly and justly, of the influence it has exerted upon the social principle, and upon the benevolent affections. Let us think upon the individual characters it has formed, and upon the new character which it has given to society. Let us consider the rescue it has obtained of the great mass of the poor, from the ignorance and vice in which heathenism has always placed and kept them; the rescue which it has effected of females, from the degraded state in which it found them, and now finds them, every where, where it attempts to exert its power. Let us consider the influence which our religion has excited upon the relations of domestick life, upon the daily intercourse of business; and upon civil governments. Let us reflect upon its influence in awakening a spirit of inquiry, and of investigation in thus indirectly aiding the progress of general knowledge; while, from the researches of philosophy, it receives itself new illustration and powerful confirmation. Above all, let us dwell upon its supports under the trials, and its consolations in the afflictions, of our life; upon the certainty which it gives of immortality; upon its views of God's character and service, and its assurance of his mercy to the penitent; upon the objects which it opens to the view of our faith, in its promises; upon the state of eternal improvement and happiness, to which it call us. And, when our minds and hearts are filled with just conceptions of all that is great, and lovely, and attractive, in the character, and in the religion of Christ; with all that is glorious and exalting to our nature, in its immediate, and in its eternal objects and interests; then let us bring as strongly home to our thoughts just sentiments of the actual condition of the heathen world. The man deserves, and has, our sincerest pity, who does not see that, gross as are the vices which exist in christendom, the religion of Christ has yet accomplished an unspeakably great improvement, in the general character of society, wherever it has prevailed. But, what is more, by the perfect rule of life which it prescribes; by the perfect example, with which it illustrates all duty; by the worship which

it has instituted; and by its promises, comprehending all which a moral and an immortal nature can desire; it has supplied us with better means, and stronger enducements, than have any of the Heathen, or, than they have ever had, to form a character, that qualifies for the purest and highest service, and enjoyment of God, in Heaven. We have as much the advantage over the Heathens, as, perhaps, some higher order of beings has over us. We have sentiments, affections, interests and hopes, which every true Christian feels are unspeakably his choicest possessions; and which Heathens cannot receive, but through the Gospel of Christ. Yes, Christianity would make them new creatures. It would bring them into a new and far happier existence; into new, most exalted, and happy relations,—I mean, to God and to Christ. It would extend to them new supports, consolations, and excitements, and exalt them to higher blessedness in the eternal kingdom of God. Are we then disciples of Christ, if the mind be not in us, with regard to the Heathen, which was in our Master and his Apostles? Are we worthy to be called his disciples, if we are unwilling to do any thing for those, whose wretched condition, but for what our Lord has done for us, might also have been our own?

The good among the Heathen will as certainly be saved, and made forever happy, as the good among Christians. But it is a mean and a narrow mind, which infers, that therefore no efforts and sacrifices are demanded from us, that the multitudes of the heathen world may be rescued from superstition, sin and misery. Our children also may be safe, as regards God's mercy in their final acceptance, should they be reared and live in utter ignorance of their Maker. But may we therefore leave them in this ignorance? And the poor around us, if brought up without instruction, and in all the vices that would be consequent upon this degraded condition, would be safe in the hands of that merciful Father and Judge, who will never require but little, where little has been given. But may we therefore leave the poor thus uninstructed, and to be vicious and miserable? Thanks be to God, that our religion has taught us otherwise to reason and to feel, concerning those immediately around us. Safe as they may be, when, by no fault of their own, they are ignorant and wretched, we yet feel that it is a great salvation that is obtained for them, even



in this world, by bringing them within the pale of Christian knowledge, and of Christian privileges. We feel, that it is an unspeakably glorious salvation, which we are setting before them in the life to come. And have we the true sympathies of our religion, if we are uninterested in the cause of extending to the Heathen, the knowledge, and the means, of this salvation?

A *second* circumstance, which has acted with no feeble power upon Unitarians, in withholding their sympathy from the cause of foreign missions, is, the very *injudicious manner in which we think these missions have been, and are conducted.*

That we should give our sympathy and aid to existing foreign missionary societies, and systems, is not the duty for which I would plead. I am satisfied, that there has been a very great waste of excitement, of money, and of life, in missionary operations, the design of which has been most benevolent. But let the question first be determined, ought we, or ought we not, to be indifferent to the condition of the heathen world? No one will say, that we should not *pray*, that the light of the knowledge of Christ may be extended to them. And, if we should pray for them, we should also *feel* for them. And if our religion demands our prayers, and our feelings, in the cause of bringing them into the church and kingdom of Christ, does it not as imperatively require our *exertions* and our *sacrifices*, in the cause? When I consider the greatness, and the excellence of the objects of the societies for foreign missions, I feel the extremest reluctance to attach even the smallest unnecessary censure to the manner, in which they have sought the attainment of these objects. I feel, and every one of us feels, that history records nothing more honourable to the moral nature, and to the moral character of man, than has been exhibited in the efforts and trials of many foreign missionaries. But, while we venerate and love the name of Swartz, of Egede, of Henry Martyn, of Carey, and of other apostles in this service, we cannot shut our eyes, nor close our understandings, against the facts, that very little has been achieved in the work of conversion, by the united exertions of the good men, who have been engaged in it; and, that the removal of missionaries from an establishment, where it was fondly believed that many thousands, and tens of thousands, had been converted, because they had been



baptized, has been followed at once by the restoration of heathen temples, and of heathen worship. If, indeed, we are to infer what is to be hoped for, only from what has been done, we have yet to look to ages, before the Brahminical faith will be superseded by Christianity. But let us not conclude that nothing more is to be done by us, than to pray, and to feel for the Heathen. Let us rather profit by the experience of those who have gone before us; and avail ourselves of their mistakes, for our own instruction.

Is it asked, then, what is to be done by us? I answer, instead of sending fifty, or twenty missionaries, to preach of original sin, of a triune God, of God's decrees, of election and reprobation, and of redemption by the blood of Christ, one of the divine persons of the trinity;—of doctrines, no one of the terms of which an uneducated Heathen can comprehend; missionaries, who will carry among the Heathen, customs which are perfectly innocent among ourselves, but most offensive to them, which yet it is thought are not to be yielded to heathen prejudice and superstition;—I will even go further, and say, instead of sending missionaries, for the immediate purpose of preaching Christianity, even in its simplest elements; let the remuneration, that is now divided among twenty, be given to two, or to three, who shall be educated for the service. Let them be made masters of natural philosophy, in all its branches. Let them be thoroughly acquainted with the science of metaphysics. Let them be deeply read in history. Let them be, at the same time, what are called practical men; men who know the world, and human nature. And, let them be Christians, without any of the narrowness of bigotry. Let these men be sent, to be companions, and friends, and teachers, among *enlightened* Mohammedans, and Heathens. Let them go among them, to live as Heathens live, in regard to all that is innocent; and to impart to those, who are capable of receiving it, a knowledge of the history, and of the philosophy, which are received in the Christian world. A few such missionaries, I think, would, in no long time, do much to unsettle, and to raze, the whole foundations of Brahminical faith, in minds which could act directly, and powerfully, as Europeans or Americans cannot act, upon the lower orders of society. And in no long time might they be instrumental of filling its place with

the purer and more rational faith of the Gospel. I believe, indeed, that they would at least do more, within a few years, in preparation for the extension of Christianity, than a hundred missionaries, employed as most missionaries now are, would accomplish in a century. We have the fact, on good authority, that a microscope was the means of convincing one intelligent, and inquisitive Brahmun, that the religion in which he had been educated was not, and could not be, the true religion. It is a fact, of which it is wonderful that missionary societies have not more availed themselves. Let us receive the lesson, which it most forcibly teaches us.\*

The experiment has not been tried, of beginning the work of propagating Christianity among civilized Heathens, by initiating their learned men into the mysteries of the philosophy, which is received in christendom. Missionaries have been, and are, striving to ascend through the lower, into the higher orders of society. Because this was done by our Saviour, it is

\* The fact here referred to may be found, I think, in the life of Sir John Forbes. In quoting the general circumstances of it from memory, I may not be perfectly correct in my statement of them ; several years having passed since I read the work from which I obtained it.

A Brahmun, who had acquired sufficient knowledge of the English language, to read it with facility, was the friend, and daily associate, of an English officer in India. This officer had a library, to which the Brahmun had free access ; and in which he passed some hours of every day, reading with peculiar avidity, the scientific articles in the British Encyclopedia. The officer received from a friend in England a very valuable microscope, and was delighted with the thought of the knowledge, which it would enable him to impart to his friend the Brahmun. He availed himself, therefore, of the first opportunity, to display the wonderful objects which it would reveal. The Hindoo saw the animalcules, that were in a drop of water ; and the tribes of insects, that found a world on a leaf. He saw, that what he had been accustomed to consider as inanimate nature, was filled with life ; and that it is impossible that man should not destroy the lives, perhaps, of thousands, as often as he received food for the support of his own existence. He immediately felt therefore, that the religion which forbade, with dreadful penalties, the destruction of animal life, could not be true. But he was silent. The officer saw with pain, the depression, and suffering of his friend. The Brahmun soon expressed a desire to possess the microscope ; and was willing to pay for it, whatever was demanded, that was within his power. The officer pleaded, that it was a gift from his friend in England, and that he could not part with it. Overcome, however, by importunity, he at length said to the Hindoo, ' take it, it is yours.' The Hindoo took it into the street, and with a stone, dashed the microscope in pieces. The officer, indignant at the sight of what the Brahmun had done, loaded him with reproaches, and demanded a reason for his conduct. ' I have destroyed that instrument,' said the Brahmun, ' because I would not have ninety millions of men, now happy in their faith, made miserable as I am, by the conviction, that this faith is a mere delusion.'



thought that, notwithstanding all the difference of circumstances, it may also be done now. But their exertions have been, and I fear will continue to be, like the labour of Sisyphus. The mistake, I think, is a radical one in the system. In the enlightened states of heathen, and of mohammedan society, from the very nature of their governments, and of all their institutions, influence must pass alone from the higher to the lower. Reformation must descend, from those who govern, to those who are governed. Should the mistakes, then, that have been made by missionary societies, and the failure of missionary endeavours, discourage exertion in the cause? Is not the cause itself good, and Christian, however injudiciously it may have been supported? Let us not bring upon ourselves, let us not justify towards ourselves, the censure, that we are cold and indifferent, in the cause of the conversion of the Heathen, because we cannot approve of the means that are employed to effect it. I have hinted at one experiment, that remains to be made; and it is a practicable one. Let us engage in it with our hearts, and I believe that God will send us prosperity. If, however, a better plan may be devised, let it be proposed, and advocated, till it shall be adopted.

*Another* cause which has withheld Unitarians from sympathy in this cause, is, what are called *the paramount claims of domestick missionary establishments.*

This objection has great force, if we reason concerning it, without referring to facts. But the misfortune of the objection is, that interest in the cause of domestick missions has every where strengthened, and has extended itself, and secured greater exertions for the advancement of Christian knowledge *at home*, in proportion as the spirit of foreign missions has been more active, and as new efforts and sacrifices have been demanded to maintain them. The history of missions, indeed, amidst all that it leaves us to pity, or to regret, has most incontrovertibly established the principle, which it is of great importance that we should understand, that when men are once brought under the power of the inducements of religion, the more they are required to do, and the more they actually do, the more they are willing and even wish to do. The religious sympathies of men do not, like their worldly sympathies, expend and exhaust themselves, by being expanded to the whole circle of human existence, and



of human necessities. Not only, like the magnet, may they forever impart, without themselves suffering diminution ; but they even grow, and enlarge, from what they communicate. There is scarcely a sect of Christians, however small it may be, except Unitarians, that does not patronise foreign missions ; and wherever, among them, you see the greatest devotion to this cause, there you see also the greatest activity in the work of awakening attention to religion *at home*, and of extending its power far and wide around them. Is this a mere action of enthusiasm ? No. The principle to which it is to be ascribed may sometimes be, and it sometimes is, sadly misdirected. The principle, however, is *religion itself*. It is the united operation of the love of God, and of man. It is sympathy with *man*, under the delusion of error, and in the misery of ignorance and of sin. It is the sentiment and feeling of gratitude and love to Christ, delighting to indulge, and to express itself in love to all, and exertions and sacrifices for all, whom he came to bless and to save. Would that we were all brought more under the power of this principle.

I have referred to the power of the sentiment on some, that the Heathen, unless converted to Christianity, are utterly lost. But I do not believe, that the missionary spirit of the age receives its principal impulse from the prevalence of this sentiment. There is a class of minds on which it acts ; but even in them, it is modified, and qualified, by other convictions, and by interests and hopes of a more decidedly Christian character. This missionary spirit receives its strongest excitement from a principle, which is purely Christian. I mean, from the sympathy that is felt in the miserably low moral condition, the moral darkness and debasement, which almost universally belong to Heathenism. It is not the idea that Heathens, merely as Heathens, are hourly plunging, by tens of thousands, into an abyss of everlasting wretchedness, which gives its activity to the zeal which we see, in the cause of foreign missions. This great effect is produced, in the first place, by the better knowledge which modern books of travels have given of the state of the Heathen world, acting in conjunction, as it does, with the better knowledge that is now, and has within a few years past been possessed, of the true spirit of Christianity ; and, secondly, by the reports

which have been sent home by missionaries ; and which have found their way, not only into the houses and hearts of those who dwell in cities and villages, but into the humblest dwelling of every hamlet, and of every forest. The narratives that are given by missionaries, of the impure and the cruel, as well as of the ridiculous superstition of idolaters ; their relations of their own toils, and privations, and sufferings ; of the resistance which they have to encounter, of the children they are educating, and of the converts which they make ; their hopes, their fears, their wants, all told in the language of the strongest feeling, and all addressed directly to the imagination, and to the sensibility, of every reader, under circumstances of all others the most suited to affect, and to persuade him ; these constitute the enginery, that is giving the mighty movement which we see, of the moral world, in this great cause. Let us pause, then, and inquire, if this sympathy with the moral state of Heathens be not a rational, and a Christian feeling ? I ask not, for it is altogether a distinct inquiry, may we place implicit reliance on the narratives of missionaries ? It is also a distinct question, and should be distinctly considered and discussed, has much good been done by missionary labours ? Decide upon these questions as unfavourably as you will, the facts still remain unaffected, that the Heathen are in a most deplorable state of moral ignorance and debasement ; that the only remedy of the evil is in Christianity ; and that in proportion to the energy with which their conversion has been sought, has been the resolution with which domestick missionary establishments have been maintained, and domestick missionary labours have been prosecuted. Say, then, if sympathy with this condition of the Heathen be not a feeling, which we ought to cherish ?

*Another* cause, which has withheld us from this enterprise, is, that until very recently, *Unitarians have been called to struggle for liberty of inquiry, and of opinion, against hosts of opposers* ; and have had too much to do, in maintaining their cause *at home*, to admit of their engaging, with any considerable energy, in a foreign service.

In reply, I will only say, that if the cause of supplanting Heathenism, and false religion, be the cause of God ; and if it be the will of God, that man shall be his agent in the work of giving universal diffusion to the knowledge of Christ ; then



do I believe that the circumstances of Unitarians, at this time, in this section at least of our country, most imperiously demand of us, that we unite our exertions for the furtherance of this great object. Let us understand our true condition, and the obligations which it imposes on us. If we may not do much, let us attempt at least to do something, for the expression of our sympathy with those in the heathen world, who, we know, are willing to receive light, and are asking for it; who have renounced Heathenism, and are willing to inquire concerning the truth of Christianity. No means, I am convinced, would be so effectual, for the advancement of correct religious sentiments, and of strong religious feelings *at home*, as would be the *esprit du corps* among us, in the cause of filling the earth with *the glory of the Lord*.

There is, however, yet *one other cause*, to which the enemies of our distinctive religious sentiments ascribe, what they call, our indifference on the subject of the conversion of the Heathen. It is said, that the evil is to be sought in *the very nature and character of our religious sentiments*.

But, is there any justice in this accusation? Is there, in our peculiar sentiments, any thing to support the charge, that Unitarianism narrows our sympathies to the confines of those who believe with us; that it brings a coldness over the heart, which benumbs those affections, that would otherwise spread themselves as widely as the existence of man? Is ours, as it is said to be, a religion of mere speculation? This we most peremptorily deny. But to deny is not to refute the accusation. How, then, is it to be refuted? We may easily satisfy ourselves upon the subject; but there is, in truth, but one argument, by which we may effectually repel this objection against our distinctive religious sentiments, and silence the cavillers who adduce it. Let our sympathy in the cause of the universal extension of the faith of Christ be manifested by the zeal and energy of our exertions in the cause, and *all* will be satisfied, that the accusation is a mere calumny. If Unitarianism chills and deadens the sensibilities of those who receive it, to the miseries and the wants of those among our fellow men, who are unblessed with revelation, this is indeed as strong against our opinions, even as our opponents represent it to be. I might, however, I think, most satisfactorily demonstrate, that in our views of Christianity, there are ex-



citements of a far higher order, than in those of any other class of Christians, to zeal in missionary labours for the conversion of the world. The time forbids me even to name them; though they furnish the best topick that could be desired, for appeals to reason, to conscience, and to the heart. But, assured as we may be, that we have been justified in the course which we have pursued, in regard to this object, the time, I think, has come, when self justification in the neglect of it, if continued, will be *sin*. Let us then vindicate ourselves against the reproach, under which we have long laboured, not by words merely, but by *deeds*. Let the experiment at least be made, whether something better than has yet been done in this work may not be accomplished.

I have tasked your patience as far as I dare to task it. I leave the subject with the earnest wish that some, who are better qualified for it than I am, will take it into their protection, and give to it their influence. I am aware that it demands the exercise of the most sober judgment, and of the soundest discretion. Let us all think, and inquire; and bring together all the light that we can obtain to bear upon it; and, let us look up to God, that he may guide us into the way of truth, and strengthen us to be faithful to his will. If the subject shall obtain sufficient attention to secure the action of other minds upon it, and to excite others to recommend and to defend it, I shall not have spoken in vain.

---

## Collections.

### *Heresy.*

‘ In all the animadversions against errors made by the Apostles in the New Testament, no pious person was condemned, no man that did invincibly err; but something that was amiss, in the principle of action, was that which the Apostles did regard. And it is very considerable, that even they of the circumcision, who in so great numbers did heartily believe in Christ, and yet most violently retain circumcision, and without question went to Heaven in great numbers; yet of the number of these very men, they came deeply under censure, when to

their error they added impiety ; so long as it stood with charity and without human ends and secular interests, so long it was either innocent or connived at ; but when they grew covetous, and for filthy lucre's sake taught the same doctrine which others did in the simplicity of their hearts, then they turned hereticks, then they were termed seducers ; and Titus was commanded to look to them, and to silence them ; *For there are many that are intractable, and vain babblers, seducers of minds, especially they of the circumcision, who seduce whole houses, teaching things that they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake.* These indeed were not to be indured, but to be silenced, by the conviction of sound doctrine, and to be rebuked sharply, and avoided.

‘ For heresy is not an error of the understanding, but an error of the will. And this is clearly insinuated in Scripture, in the style whereof faith and a good life are made one duty, and vice is called opposite to faith, and heresy opposed to holiness and sanctity. So in St. Paul, *For (saith he) the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned ;* \* from which charity, and purity, and goodness, and sincerity, because some have wandered, have turned aside unto vain jangling. And immediately after, he reckons the oppositions to faith and sound doctrine, and instances only in vices, that stain the lives of Christians, *the unjust, the unclean, the uncharitable, the liar, the perjured person ;* these are the enemies of the true doctrine. And therefore St. Peter having given in charge, to add to our virtue patience, temperance, charity, and the like, gives this for a reason, for if these things be in you, and abound, ye shall be fruitful in the *knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.* So that knowledge and faith is *inter præcepta morum*, is part of a good life.—*Jeremy Taylor's Liberty of Prophesying*, pp. 31—33.

‘ A wicked person in his error becomes heretick, when the good man in the same error shall have all the rewards of faith. For whatever an ill man believes, if he therefore believes it because it serves his own ends, be his belief true or false, the man hath an heretical mind, for to serve his own ends, his mind is prepared to believe a lie. But a good man that believes what, according to his light, and upon the use of his

\* 1 Tim. i. 5.

moral industry he thinks true, whether he hits upon the right or no, because he hath a mind desirous of truth, and prepared to believe every truth, is therefore acceptable to God, because nothing hindered him from it but what he could not help, his misery and his weakness, which being imperfections merely natural, which God never punishes, he stands fair for a blessing of his morality, which God always accepts.' *Ib.* p. 59.

*The Fathers.*

'There are some that think they can determine all questions in the world by two or three sayings of the Fathers, or by the consent of so many as they will please to call a concurrent testimony; but this consideration will soon be at an end; for if the Fathers, when they are witnesses of tradition, do not always speak truth, as it happened in the case of Papias and his numerous followers for almost three ages together, then is their testimony more improbable when they dispute or write commentaries.' *Ib.* p. 215.

*Innocent Errours.*

'As for guiding our judgments and the use of our reason in judging for ourselves, all that is to be said is reducible to this one proposition. Since errours are then made sins, when they are contrary to charity, or inconsistent with a good life and the honour of God, that judgment is the truest, or at least that opinion most innocent that 1, best promotes the reputation of God's glory, and 2, is the best instrument of a holy life. For in questions and interpretations of dispute, these two analogies are the best to make propositions, and conjectures, and determinations. Diligence and care in obtaining the best guides, and the most convenient assistance; prayer, and modesty of spirit, simplicity of purposes and intentions, humility and aptness to learn, and a peaceable disposition, are therefore necessary to finding out truths, because they are parts of a good life, without which our truths will do us little advantage, and our errours can have no excuse, but with these dispositions, as he is sure to find out all that is necessary, so what truth he inculpably misses of, he is sure is therefore not necessary, because he could not find it when he did his best and his most innocent endeavours.' *Ib.* pp. 268, 269.



*Private Judgment.*

‘Now the way to our future happiness has been perpetually disputed throughout the world, and must be left at last to the impressions made upon every man’s belief and conscience, either by natural or supernatural arguments and means ; which impressions men may disguise or dissemble, but no man can resist. For belief is no more in a man’s power, than his stature or his feature ; and he that tells me I must change my opinion for his, because it is the truer and the better, without other arguments, that have to me the force of conviction, may as well tell me I must change my grey eyes for others like his that are black, because these are lovelier or more in esteem. He that tells me I must inform myself, has reason, if I do it not. But if I endeavour it all that I can, and perhaps more than he ever did, and yet still differ from him ; and he that, it may be, is idle, will have me study on and inform myself better, and so to the end of my life ; then I easily understand what he means by informing, which is, in short, that I must do it till I am of his opinion.

‘If he that, perhaps, pursues his pleasures or interests as much or more than I do, and allows me to have as good sense as he has in all other matters, tells me I should be of his opinion, but that passion or interest blinds me ; unless he can convince me how or where this lies, he is but where he was, only pretends to know me better than I do myself, who cannot imagine why I should not have as much care of my soul as he has of his.

‘A man that tells me my opinions are absurd or ridiculous, impertinent or unreasonable, because they differ from his, seems to intend a quarrel instead of a dispute, and calls me fool or madman with a little more circumstance ; though perhaps I pass for one as well in my senses as he, as pertinent in talk, and as prudent in life. Yet these are the common civilities in religious argument of sufficient and conceited men, who talk much of right reason, and mean always their own ; and make their private imagination the measures of general truth. But such language determines all between us, and the dispute comes to end in three words at last, which it might as well have ended in at first—That he is in the right, and I am in the wrong.’—*Sir W. Temple’s Observations on Unit. Prov.* 8vo, 7th ed. 1705, pp. 191—193.

**Poetry.**

## HYMN FOR THE OPENING OF AN ORGAN.

All Nature's works his praise declare,  
To whom they all belong ;  
There is a voice in every star,  
In every breeze a song.

Sweet musick fills the world abroad  
With strains of love and power ;  
The stormy sea sings praise to God,  
The thunder, and the shower.

To God the tribes of ocean cry,  
And birds upon the wing ;  
To God the powers that dwell on high,  
Their tuneful tribute bring.

Like them let man the throne surround ;  
With them loud chorus raise ;  
While instruments of loftiest sound,  
Assist his feeble praise.

Great God ! to thee we consecrate,  
Our voices and our skill ;  
We bid the pealing organ wait,  
To speak alone thy will.

O, teach its rich and swelling notes,  
To lift our souls on high ;  
And while the musick round us floats,  
Let earth born passion die.

## Review.

ART. VII.—*Biblisch-kritische Reise, &c. i. e. Travels for the purpose of Biblical Criticism in France, Switzerland, Italy, Palestine, and the Archipelago, during the Years 1818, 1819, 1820, and 1821 ; with a History of the Text of the New Testament.* By DR. JOHN MARTIN AUGUSTIN SCHOLTZ, Professor of Theology in the University at Bonn. Leipsic. Fleischer. 1823. 8vo. pp. 214.

DR. SCHOLTZ, who is a Roman Catholick, is preparing a new critical edition of the New Testament. He undertook these travels for the purpose of examining and collating manuscripts. The first, and much the longest part of his work consists, principally, of accounts of the number, which he found in different libraries, and particular remarks upon the character of some, with specimens of their various readings, glosses, corrections, subscriptions, &c. This part admits of no abstract, and affords but little opportunity for selecting any notices of particular interest.

The Royal Library at Paris, he observes, possesses a greater number of valuable manuscripts than any other. Even the Vatican can compare with it only in the particular department of Syriack manuscripts. There are found in it nine manuscripts of the whole New Testament, one hundred and twelve of the Gospels, forty nine Evangelistaries, twenty four manuscripts of the Acts and the Epistles, three of the Acts, with the Catholick Epistles alone, sixteen of the Epistles of St. Paul, or of portions of these Epistles, nine of the Apocalypse, and eight containing various readings on the whole New Testament.

The Ephraim manuscript, containing the whole New Testament, is the most famous and valuable of those in the Paris Library. Dr. Scholtz expresses a wish, as Griesbach had done before him, that it should be printed, as the Alexandrine and Cambridge manuscripts have been. It is becoming daily more illegible. 'It has,' he remarks, 'all the peculiar characteristicks which belonged to the numberless manuscripts



of Egypt, which are now lost ; and is thus a true copy of the text, which was in use in this famous Patriarchy, and with which, alas ! we are but very imperfectly acquainted.' The apparent inconsistency between the last clause and what precedes, may be partly explained by the circumstance, that the Ephraim manuscript is very defective, much of the writing being wholly defaced. He praises, as other criticks have done, the diligence and patience of Wetstein in tracing its almost obliterated characters ; but says that it is objected to him concerning this, as well as other manuscripts, that he has quoted only a portion of its various readings. As it regards the Ephraim manuscript, we doubt whether there is any more ground for the assertion, than there is for many of the other attacks, which have been made upon this eminent critick. The present state of the manuscript may be conjectured from what Griesbach relates, that the keeper of the Royal Library, though very polite and attentive, could scarcely be persuaded to listen to his request to produce it ; on the ground that the writing was so obliterated, that it was impossible for any one to read it. He was struck with admiration, when he found that Griesbach was able to read whole lines with little difficulty.\*

In the Vatican Library, are nine manuscripts of the whole New Testament, seven of which were seen by Birch ; fifty one manuscripts of the Gospels, twenty seven of which were examined by Birch, and twenty four for the first time by Scholtz. Sixteen Evangelistaries, (first examined by Scholtz,) sixteen manuscripts of the Acts and Epistles, five only of which are quoted by Griesbach, nine of the Epistles of St. Paul, (one of them containing also the Apocalypse,) five only of which are quoted by Griesbach, three of the Apocalypse alone, and two Lectionaries.

Dr. Scholtz has discovered in the Vatican Library another manuscript, containing the famous text 1 John, v. 7. It is marked Ottob. 298. It contains the Acts and Epistles, is accompanied with a Latin translation, and was written, as he supposes, in the fifteenth century.

We will give the text as it is quoted by Scholtz from this manuscript, noting the variations of the Dublin manuscript, or Codex Montfortianus, the only other in which it is found,

\* *Symbolæ Criticæ*, I. 4.

excepting the Berlin, or Codex Ravianus, which is now universally given up as a forgery.

*Απο του ουρανου* [the Dublin manuscript reads *εν τφουρανφ*] *πατηρ, λογος και πνευμα αγιον • και* [the Dublin inserts *οντοι*] *οι τρεις εις το* [the Dublin omits *εις το*] *εν ειςι • και τρεις ειδιν* *οι μαρτυρουντες απο της γης* [the Dublin reads *εν τη γη*].

The text of the Ottoboni manuscript, Scholtz observes, has been, in many other places, corrupted from the Latin version.

In a short digression annexed to his account of the library at Paris, the author mentions some manuscript letters of Wetstein. They are in the possession of M. Champollion-Figeac at Paris. From one of them, addressed to Mr. Wetstein, chaplain to the Princess of Wales, Dr. Scholtz quotes an interesting passage, of which we will give a part. The original is in French.

Wetstein, after remarking that he has been charged with plagiarism, meaning in his commentary, says ; ‘I read Greek and Latin authors for forty years, and it was thus that I began my labour. After retouching the work and my collections, I consulted the Thesaurus of Henry Stephens, and all those who have given notes, Price, Grotius, Alberti, Elsner, Raphel, Morus, Majus, &c. and from them I completed my collection, though seven eighths of their observations were already in my papers. If any one is disposed to believe that I have taken every thing from them, he may still enjoy the advantage of finding brought together, what he would have been obliged to seek in ten or twelve octavos not very common in England. As to the Hebrew [Rabbinical] quotations, I began at second hand with Lightfoot, Schoettgen, and Buxtorf’s Lexicon ; but in order to complete the work, I read myself the Babylonian Talmud, and all the Rabboth.’

It was thus that this most valuable commentary was formed. Wetstein speaks of it in the conclusion of his letter with equal propriety and modesty.

‘The commentary was not my principal object, but only an accessory to my work ; and it is rather a mass of materials, than an arranged and finished edifice.’

This is true ; but it is a mass of materials, which subsequent scholars have used most freely, and to the greatest advantage.

In the last portion of his work, Dr. Scholtz gives his views of the history of the text of the New Testament, of the classifi-



cation of authorities, and of their relative value. On these points, he differs from Griesbach, and most other preceding criticks. The subject is important ; and we shall take this opportunity to make some remarks upon it. The statements and theory of Griesbach seem to us to lie open to great objections, while, at the same time, we are far from adopting the opinions of the present writer.

Griesbach divides the authorities for settling the text of the New Testament into three principal classes, called by him *recensiones*, recensions, or critical editions. He regards the manuscripts, versions, and quotations, belonging respectively to each of these classes, as more or less conformed to a standard text different from that of either of the two other classes. The grounds of this classification are briefly explained by him in the third section of the Prolegomena to his edition of the New Testament. 'That two different *recensions*,' he says, 'were in existence at the commencement of the third century, appears from comparing the quotations of Origen with those of Tertullian and Cyprian. The Greek Text, implied in the quotations of the latter, is different in its whole conformation and entire colouring (*toto suo habitu universoque colore*) from that which was used by Origen, and, before him, by Clement of Alexandria. The former text is found in those manuscripts, in which the Greek text is accompanied with a Latin version, in the Latin versions which preceded the Vulgate, in that portion of the Vatican manuscript, which contains the Gospel of Matthew,' in seven other more modern manuscripts mentioned by him, 'in the Sahidick version, and the Syriack of Jerusalem.' The latter text (the Alexandrine) is found in the Ephraim manuscript, in that marked L, in the Gospels (the Codex Stephani  $\eta$ ,) in the Vatican, with the exception of the first and greater part of St. Matthew's Gospel, in that part of the Alexandrine, which contains St. Paul's Epistles, in a very few more modern manuscripts, though in these in a more corrupt state, in the Coptick, Æthiopick, Armenian and Philoxenian-Syriack versions, and in the quotations of Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, Isidore of Pelusium, and others. This text, being used by Clement and Origen, who flourished at Alexandria, and generally at Alexandria and throughout Egypt, may be denominated the *Alexandrine*. The other text, being from the time of Tertullian used throughout the West in the Latin



Church, may be called the *Western*. It was not, however, says Griesbach, 'confined within the bounds of the Western Empire, as appears from the agreement of the Sahidick version, and the Syriack of Jerusalem, which though not constant is frequent.' But besides these two most ancient texts, there was a third, which is first found in the quotations of the Greek Fathers, who flourished about the close of the fourth, and in the fifth and sixth centuries. It has been distinguished into the earlier and later, and in one or the other form is found in the great majority of manuscripts; and in the Slavonick and Gothick versions. It prevailed in the Patriarchy of Constantinople, and was thence spread over the world. It may therefore be denominated the *Constantinopolitan* or *Byzantine*.

The characteristicks of these three different texts, as given by Griesbach, are as follows.

'The Western text preserves genuine readings of a harsher kind, remote from the analogy of the Greek language, Hebraisms, solecisms, cacophonies; by all which Western readers would be less offended. In the Alexandrine recension, there appears a disposition to remove or alter whatever might be offensive to the ear of a native Greek. The Western endeavours to explain the sense, and render it more obvious by interpretations, periphrases, additions, which were eagerly sought for, (*additamentis undecunque conquisitis*), and by transpositions of words and sentences. It is the object of the Alexandrine to improve the language, rather than illustrate the meaning. The Western presents us with longer readings, it has more words, it contains additions derived from parallel passages; but it also sometimes omits words, which seem to obscure the sense, or to be contradictory to the context, or to what is found elsewhere; in all which respects the Alexandrine is purer. In a word, in the Alexandrine text we discover the work of a grammarian, in the Western that of an interpreter. In all the particulars which have been mentioned, the Byzantine corresponds much with the Alexandrine, differing from it only in discovering yet more regard to purity of language, and in admitting readings from the Western text different from the Alexandrine, or readings compounded of those found in both texts.' 'The origin,' says Griesbach, 'of these different recensions, in the deficiency of ancient documents and testimony, cannot be historically explained.'

In remarking upon what has been quoted, we will first notice the exaggerated language used by Griesbach, quite remote from the sober statements, to be expected in a mere critical disquisition. The Western text, he says, differs from the Alexandrine 'in its whole conformation and entire colouring.' Let us, in the first place, compare this with his own language, found elsewhere. The Cambridge manuscript is regarded by Griesbach as containing the Western text, and the Codex Stephani  $\eta$  as one of those which preserve the Alexandrine in its greatest purity. In comparing the readings of these manuscripts, and of Origen, he says ;

'From the frequent agreement of the Cambridge manuscript with L and Origen, it appears that the most ancient Western recension agreed with the Alexandrine in innumerable places ;'\* that is, of course must be meant, in innumerable variations from the received text.

But the comparison here instituted between the two supposed texts, though it leads to the conclusion just quoted respecting their agreement with each other, cannot be regarded as a fair one. The Cambridge manuscript cannot be considered as belonging to any class of manuscripts, so as to be a fair representative of their standard text. It has a peculiar character. A part of the title of one of the chapters in Father Simon's Critical History of the text of the New Testament, is this ; '*Why is the Cambridge manuscript so different from other Greek copies ?*' 'I suspect,' says Bishop Middleton, 'that all the collated manuscripts put together do not contain one half the readings in which the Codex Bezae (that is, the Cambridge manuscript,) differs from the received text.'† In the fourth chapter of St. John's Gospel (which we have taken without selection) there are, if we have counted rightly, seventy seven various readings quoted by Wetstein from this manuscript, omitting to notice one which is obviously an accidental error in the spelling of a word. Of these, thirty seven appear to be found in no other Greek manuscript, and twenty seven to be supported by no other authority of any kind. Whatever may be thought of the hypothesis of Matthæi respecting the origin of this manuscript, it sufficiently corresponds to the phenomena which it presents ; 'My suspi-

\* *Symbolæ Criticæ*, vol. I. p. 118.

† Middleton on the Greek Article ; Appendix on the Cod. Bezae.



cion, respecting it,' he says, 'is this. Some Latin monk, having a moderate acquaintance with the Greek language, had written in the margin of his Greek New Testament, passages both from Greek and Latin fathers, which seemed to refer to particular passages of the New Testament. He had noted likewise various readings of some Greek and Latin manuscripts of the New Testament. He had added parallel passages of the sacred writings. From this miscellaneous collection, either he, or some other person, prepared a text according to his own judgment. From a copy of this sort, different from all others, the Cambridge manuscript was derived.'\* It seems clear that a manuscript of such a character cannot properly be considered as a representative of any class of authorities. We have made these remarks not wholly in reference to the point in hand; but because the Cambridge manuscript (*occidentalium facile princeps*, as it is called by Griesbach) is a main pillar of the theory respecting a separate Western text with its peculiar characteristics. How much it is so, may appear in some degree from a passage in a work which Griesbach published in 1811, but a year before his death, in which he says, 'that there existed from the second and third century various recensions of the sacred text, one of which, as respects the Gospels, remains in D, (the Cambridge manuscript,) another in manuscripts B C L, and another in manuscripts E F G H S, and others.'† Here the Cambridge manuscript is mentioned alone as the representative of the Western text.

We will produce another passage from Griesbach. In the epistles, he compares the readings of the Clermont manuscript, which he considers as in this part of the New Testament, a representative of the Western text, with the Alexandrine authorities, Origen and manuscripts C and L; and remarks; 'The Western recension, as far as we are acquainted with it from this manuscript, was nearly allied to the Alexandrine.'‡ We may compare this with the language used in his *Prolegomena*; and in order to show more clearly the extravagance of the latter, we may blend the words of both sentences into one: *Recensio occidentalis cum Alexandrinâ satis propinquâ cognatione conjuncta fuit; quamvis toto suo habitu, universoque colore diversa ab illâ.*

\* Quoted by Middleton, *ubi sup.*

† *Symbolæ Criticæ*, vol. I. p. 138.

‡ *Comment. Crit. P. II. p. 68.*



But the exaggeration of the language used by Griesbach, respecting the difference between the Alexandrine and the Western text, may appear to any one who will take the trouble of comparing together their various readings in his common critical study of the New Testament. No text of any class of manuscripts, or of any manuscript, can be said with propriety to vary 'in its whole conformation and entire colouring' from any other. Examine for a few pages together *all* the various readings collected by Wetstein and Griesbach. It is more probable than otherwise, that you will not meet with one of importance, we do not say as affecting the sense, but as affecting the character of the style. In speaking of the Cambridge manuscript, Middleton remarks in a spirit of exaggeration similar to that of Griesbach: 'If we had, at the present day, no other Greek manuscript of the Gospels, almost every thing which the learned have determined respecting the style and language of the Evangelists would be wholly unfounded.'\* But what can be meant by such a remark? What proportion of the criticisms in Gataker de Novi Instrumenti stylo, so far as they relate to the Gospels, would cease to be applicable? How much of Vorstius de Hebraismis could be dispensed with in consequence? What proportion of Glasse's *Philologia Sacra* would the case supposed render useless? How many new words or new senses would it be necessary to add to Schleusner's *Lexicon*; or how many now found in it would it be necessary to strike out? The whole amount of the difference between the text of the Cambridge manuscript, and the corrected text of Griesbach, so far as it regards the characteristicks of the style, consists in a few anomalous expressions, especially in an occasional improper use or neglect of the article, a circumstance not uncommon in Greek manuscripts, written by a Latin transcriber; and, as we believe, a few Latinisms, arising from the circumstance that the Greek text has been in these passages conformed to some Latin text; though this last characteristick is so far from being glaring, that its existence has been disputed by most modern criticks; and the current of opinion has of late run counter to the supposition. Middleton himself has furnished a collation of one chapter from this manuscript, and the most important various readings from two

\* Middleton, ubi sup.

others. Every one may see to how little they amount, as affecting the style of the New Testament.

But this manuscript presents an extreme case. We can bring such language, as we have quoted from Griesbach to a fairer test. The Byzantine text is regarded by him, as of the least authority, as the most corrupt. But this is the text which, as found in the later and least valuable manuscripts of the class, was, according to him, the groundwork of the received text. His opinions concerning the latter are expressed in the first part of his prolegomena. The following is the statement of another writer of his school of criticism, Bertholdt; 'the received text is such a wretched mixture,\* as is not found in the most modern and most corrupted manuscripts of the New Testament. Its groundwork is the text found in very modern manuscripts.†' On the other hand, it was the object of Griesbach, in his corrected text, to approximate the original text as nearly as possible. Here then we have the two extremes, the purest and the most corrupt text. Let us compare them together, and see how great is the disagreement. There can be no question, that he would be thought to make a very wild assertion, who should say that Griesbach's text differed in its 'whole constitution and entire colouring' from the received text. But in making this comparison we have brought together texts which, according to his hypothesis, should be most unlike; the most pure, and the most corrupt. What then shall we say of such language as applied to the Alexandrine and the Western texts? Did either the Alexandrine or the Western text differ more than the received text from the original? If so, one or the other, or both, was more corrupt than the received text, contrary to all Griesbach's statements. If they differed less from this common standard, then their differences, when compared together, must have been small indeed.

We should not have remarked so much at length upon a single passage, however objectionable, but language of a similar character is common in the writings of Griesbach, and other German critics; and it is adapted to convey very false notions respecting the history of the text of the New

\* Greulicher Mischmasch, literally 'shocking hotch-potch.'

† Bertholdt's *Historisch-kritische Einleitung*, &c. i. e. *Introduction to the Old and New Testaments*, Part I. p. 356.



Testament, and the present state of the authorities for settling its text. It affords ground for a strong suspicion, that the whole hypothesis, with which it is connected, rests more upon fancy than upon fact. Its want of correctness may appear still further from what immediately follows.

We now come to another point, and that is the question, whether there be any sufficient ground for supposing that two different, well defined texts, the Alexandrine and the Western, ever existed. On this subject Dr. Scholtz expresses himself decidedly in the negative. He says, 'there is no ground for distinguishing between those which have been called Alexandrine, and those which have been called Western manuscripts. In my opinion they fall into one class. They respectively differ so much from each other, that if we regard any thing more than their general character, and undertake to separate them into classes, according to their specifick peculiarities, we must make as many classes as there are documents.'\* Dr. Laurence entertains a similar opinion; and the most remarkable statements, which we have met with respecting this subject, are to be found in his work. The quotations of Origen it will be recollected afford, according to Griesbach, the highest standard of comparison for the Alexandrine class. But, respecting these quotations, Dr. Laurence remarks as follows; 'In order to ascertain the true character of the readings of Origen, the whole of them together, and not a partial selection, should be examined. With this impression, I have given all which a diligent investigation enabled me to discover, in the Epistles of St. Paul, and have noted those which agree with other Alexandrine authorities, or with the Western, or with both. The total amount of his readings is *six hundred and nine*, out of which there are *two hundred and twenty six*, which coincide with either Western or Alexandrine authority, or with both. Of the remainder, many, indeed, not unfrequently accord with the Byzantine, but many more are perfectly insulated. The number, however, of the latter may doubtless be very considerably reduced, by making due allowances for the freedom of quotation, and for the errors of transcription. And perhaps a still farther reduction, if not an almost entire annihilation, might be effected by our acquisition of completer collations of Fathers,

\* Pages 178, 179.



manuscripts, and versions, than we at present possess. How numerous the collateral readings of this kind are, with which we are yet unacquainted, may be conjectured from the many additions not long since made by Matthæi to those of Chrysostom alone; and even by the very quotations of Origen under consideration, of no contemptible part of which we were altogether ignorant, until they were brought to light by the laborious scrutiny of Griesbach. But, notwithstanding the great amount of this incongruous remainder, there are found a sufficient number of congruous readings for the purpose, at least of a comparative examination.

‘There occur *two hundred and twenty six*, which coincide with one or both of the classes alluded to. Of these, *one hundred and eighteen* are supported by Western authority alone, *ninety* by both Western and Alexandrine united, and *only eighteen* by Alexandrine alone. Supposing the existence of an Alexandrine text, we may presume, that Origen would frequently have associates of that description in *peculiar* readings; but this presumption is far from being warranted by fact. For in truth, the very reverse takes place; as, out of *two hundred and twenty six* readings, Origen has but *eighteen* distinguishable from the Western text, in which he is joined by any other Alexandrine Father. Nor even in this limited number of *eighteen*, does he read in conjunction with more than *one* Alexandrine, (sometimes with Clemens, and sometimes with Cyrill,) except in the following five instances; Rom. iii. 30; 1 Cor. iv. 13; viii. 8; Ephes. v. 25; Philip. i. 24. in which he receives a double support. On the other hand, his alliance with Western authority, in exclusion of the Alexandrine, is so intimate, that he reads with that alone, not *eighteen*, but *one hundred and eighteen times*, a full moiety of the whole amount. Neither does he here often read with one or two, but generally (the source indeed being more prolific) with numerous associates.’\*

Besides Origen, Clement of Alexandria is another of Griesbach’s principal Alexandrine authorities. Of Clement, however, he himself thus speaks in his last work; ‘I readily concede that he often quoted passages of the New Testament from the Western edition, and agrees wonderfully (*et consentire mirum*

\* Laurence’s Remarks upon the Systematical Classification of Manuscripts adopted by Griesbach, pp. 129—132.

*in modum*) with the Cambridge manuscript. But he agrees also, not unfrequently, (*non raro consonat*,) with the Alexandrine manuscripts B C D, and this not only in passages where they give the same reading with the manuscript B, but elsewhere also, where the Alexandrine authorities differ from the Western.\* It would seem, from all that has been quoted, that Clement and Origen, though put forward as leaders in the cause, are but doubtful Alexandrines, and well disposed to go over to the enemy ; if, in fact, they be not both open traitors.

But without, at present, entering further into the question, whether the more ancient authorities are to be divided into classes *upon any principle*, we will consider that which Griesbach has adopted, and remark upon the inconsistency with which he has explained himself. This principle is, that the authorities of each class are derived respectively from a standard text, peculiar to that class, of which they are more or less faithful exemplars. Two different standard texts, according to him, existed before the close of the second century ; and another was subsequently formed, from which the Byzantine authorities are derived. He uses, in denoting his classes, the word *recensio*, the meaning of which is ‘critical edition,’ and which implies the existence of a standard text formed with care. ‘A critick,’ says Griesbach, in explaining his system, ‘who bringing together many manuscripts, or other helps, so remodels the text of any work, as to cause it to differ in its whole conformation from the text of all other manuscripts, is to be considered as the author of a new *recension*.’† He speaks of the ‘*ancient and native readings*’ of the Alexandrine text.‡ He says that ‘no manuscript of either recension (the Alexandrine or Western) has come down to us, which has not been interpolated in many places ; § no recension is found in any remaining manuscript *such as it originally existed*.’|| He speaks of ‘distinguishing the later interpolations and glosses from the *genuine and primitive readings* of either recension.’¶ He says that the Alexan-

\* *Commentarius Criticus*. Part II. p. XLIX.

† Criticus, qui adhibitis codicibus pluribus, aliisque subsidiis, textum libri cujusdam ita refingit, ut habitu universo, a cæterorum codicum omnium textu differat, novam recensionem elaborasse censendus est. *Cura in Epist. Paulin.* p. 31. See also what precedes and follows.

‡ *Symb. Crit.* I. 108.

|| *Prolegom.* in N. T. Sect. III.

§ *Ibid.* p. 112.

¶ *Symb. Crit.* I. p. 120.



drine and Western recensions are *equally ancient*.\* In his last work he adopts the opinion of Hug, that the Byzantine authorities are to be referred to a text, which had been critically formed by Lucian ;† or in other words that Lucian is the author of the Byzantine recension. But above all, it is the main principle of his criticism on the New Testament, that every authority is to be referred to its particular class, and regarded, in the first instance, merely as serving to determine the reading of the standard text of that recension to which it belongs. All the authorities of one class, as they are all derived from one standard text, are to be considered only as a single evidence. The comparative authority of the different recensions, each being considered as a single evidence, and their agreement or disagreement with each other, are alone to be *ultimately* regarded, in determining the probability of different readings from authority or external evidence. Our existing documents are *direct* authority, not for the original text of the New Testament, but only for the text of the recension, to which they respectively belong.

In his Introduction to the Old and New Testaments, Bertholdt explains at length the opinions of Griesbach, and ascribes to him 'the immortal honour of having first fully comprehended, and clearly explained,' the system of the classification of authorities. The foundations of this system, he considers as immovable. Still he regards it as in some respects defective and objectionable. 'Griesbach's system of criticism,' he says, 'taking its commencement from the two oldest recensions, which had their origin in the last half of the second century, leaves untouched the long period from the composition of the writings of the New Testament to the middle of that century.' He refers to an article in a German journal, written by Griesbach himself, in which Bertholdt says that Griesbach expressly professes 'to have had no higher purpose than to restore the text, in all its essential parts, such as it existed in the two original collections, which were made, one of the Gospels called *Εὐαγγέλιον*, and the other of the Epistles called *Αποστολος*.' 'As it regards the original text,' says the oratorical German, 'he passes from the bounds of the *empirical* and throws himself into the arms of the *higher* criticism.'‡

\* Symb. Crit. I. p. 119.

† Comment. Crit. Partic. II. p. LVII.

‡ Bertholdt's Introduction, Part I. p. 317.



All this, at least as far as we have taken our statements directly from Griesbach, is intelligible, and we may add, with the same qualification, consistent. But what has been alleged from him is not consistent with what is found elsewhere in his writings. We will quote from one of his earliest works, and from his latest; his *Curæ in Epistolas Paulinas*, and his *Commentarius Criticus*.

In the former, he supposes, that the undisputed Epistles (οἱ ομολογουμενοι) were collected into a volume before the middle of the second century, though he expresses a doubt whether it were done so early. This collection was called ὁ Αποστολος. 'It cannot be determined,' he says, 'whether the text of this collection was derived from the very originals, or from copies of particular Epistles, or from some partial collections. We may readily believe that the editor transcribed one or two Epistles from the originals; but it is hardly probable that they were all so copied. It is enough for us that the collection exhibited a sufficiently genuine text; and had no false readings, which would either remarkably change the sense, or corrupt and deprave the doctrine of the Apostles. For, as the collection was received by all the Catholick churches, not excepting those to whom the Epistles had formerly been written, we may infer that no one suspected the editor of changing or interpolating their text; but that this edition agreed with those copies, which, being taken from the originals, were already in the hands of many learned men before the collection was published.' The Epistles being thus brought together into a volume, and the collection being published, copies of it were soon multiplied. But it is not probable that those more ancient manuscripts, which were in existence before its publication, were thrown aside or destroyed by their possessors. Every one retained that which he had before used, merely adding those Epistles which he found wanting in his copy. 'From this time,' continues Griesbach, 'there were two sorts of manuscripts, one the copies of those which existed before the collection, the Αποστολος, was formed; and the other copies of the latter, of the new edition. 'Here then,' he says, 'we discover, unless I am altogether deceived, the origin of two different recensions. Deprehendimus igitur, nisi nos fallunt omnia, *duarum recensio- num diversarum incunabula*!' The italics and the note of admiration are his

own. The Latins were more tenacious of the ancient manuscripts. The Greeks, among whom there were more ready transcribers of Greek, and among whom therefore a new Greek manuscript could be more easily procured, gradually laid aside those obsolete copies, and adopted in their stead transcripts of the new collection. 'If the text of the *Αποστολος* was freed by the editor from some Hebraisms, and forms of expression, unusual among native Greeks, it might be more agreeable to them, than that harsher Western recension in which they were retained. Into the latter, however, many glosses early crept in, but such as regarded the sense, more than the Greek idiom.' Griesbach then proceeds to point out what he supposes the characteristic of these two classes of manuscripts, as they were propagated by transcribers. These are the same which he has assigned respectively to the Western and Alexandrine recension, in his prolegomena to the New Testament.\*

Here then we have one of his earliest accounts of what he calls the Western and Alexandrine recensions. Its inconsistency with what we have before quoted is obvious. There was, according to this account, no Western *recension*, in the sense in which he elsewhere uses the term. There was no standard text for manuscripts of this class but the original text. It is to this that the authorities belonging to the Western class, according to Griesbach's own statement, carry us back directly, without the intervention of any critical edition. The Alexandrine and Western texts are not equally ancient, the former is derived from the *Apostolos*, the latter from the originals. One of the only two ancient recensions, which he supposes, is struck out, and a theory of criticism must fall which rests upon the supposition of two. The existence, indeed, even of an Alexandrine *recension* seems not very confidently stated. But allowing the existence of the latter, yet according to what has been quoted, each manuscript of the Western class is to be referred to the original text as its archetype, and not to be regarded merely as determining the text of a subsequent critical edition. It is not to our purpose to insist upon the fact, that the statements which we have quoted, so far as they imply any peculiar theory, are merely conjectural; though it may be worth while for every one studying the works of German

\* *Curæ in Epist. Paulin.* pp. 66—72.



scholars, to attend well to the distinction between what is asserted and what is proved. All, with which we are at present concerned, is the inconsistency of these statements with Griesbach's principles of criticism.

But in his *Commentarius Criticus*, the whole doctrine of two standard texts, the Western and Alexandrine, may be considered as abandoned. In this work, he remarks upon a new theory, or rather upon a new modification of his own theory, proposed by Hug. The latter, which deserves little attention, it is not necessary to explain, except so far as it is connected with Griesbach's statements. Hug supposes that there was no *recension* before one made by Hesychius, about the middle of the third century. Previous to that time, there existed only the *common edition*, *εκδοσις κοινη*, derived without intervention from the original text ; and to this he refers the principal Western authorities. Upon this Griesbach remarks ; ' In the first place, respecting the Western recension, or the *common edition*, there is a sufficient agreement between Hug and myself. I did not suppose that we were indebted for its original formation to the labour of any learned man, revising a copy before him, and settling the text by the collation of manuscripts according to his own judgment ; but I rather supposed that it was derived from ancient copies of single books of the New Testament, or from partial collections of those books. Not a few manuscripts of this kind were in general circulation before the publication of the *Ευαγγελιον* and the *Αποστολος*, and were afterwards laid aside by the Greeks, but preserved by the Latins or Western Christians. But although such was its origin, I did not hesitate to call the Western text, a *recension* ; partly, because in works of criticism, mention is often to be made conjointly of the Alexandrine and Byzantine *recensions* and of the Western *text* ; and therefore, for the sake of brevity, I thought that they might all not improperly be called by the common name of *recension* ; partly, because I doubted whether it could be proved, by sufficient historical arguments, that the text of the other families, the Alexandrine and Byzantine, derived its origin, as regards either class, from the revision of any particular critick ; and lastly, because I was persuaded that the text of the manuscript D, which takes the lead among Western authorities, was transcribed from another, which some



critick had diligently revised, upon certain principles. For these reasons I think I spoke without rashness of a Western *recension*.\*

It cannot be necessary to remark at length upon this passage. Griesbach adopted, it seems, the word 'recension' in preference to 'text,' or 'class,' or 'family,' or any other, because it suited two of the subjects to which it was applied, though it did not suit the other; because he doubted whether it was really more applicable to the two former than to the latter; and because one manuscript, which he reckons of the Western class, actually exhibited a text, which might be called a recension. But it is not to the improper use of this word that we particularly object. The point is, that what is peculiar in his system of criticism falls to the ground, if the word be not properly used.

Notwithstanding what has been quoted, however, Griesbach is still unwilling to give up the notion of a recension; and, though he thinks no account is to be given of the author of the Alexandrine, he adopts the opinion of Hug, that we are indebted to Lucian for the Byzantine.† We have not seen the work of Hug, but find an abstract of his theory and arguments in Bertholdt. Lucian published a revised edition of the New Testament, but the supposition, that copies of it ever obtained general circulation, seems to rest merely upon an error. Hug, and Bertholdt following him, have both applied to his edition of the New Testament, language used by Jerom in reference to an edition of the Septuagint, likewise published by him.‡ Of both the Septuagint and the New Testament, however, Jerom elsewhere says, that '*their authority is perversely maintained by a few.*'§

If the notion of a standard Western text, different from the original, were not sufficiently abandoned in what we have quoted, it might be urged against it, that the Sahidick version is classed by Griesbach with the Western authorities. But how could a Western penetrate through the Alexandrine text into Upper Egypt? The old Syriack version, likewise, we are told by Michaelis, agrees remarkably with the Western authorities. 'There is a general coincidence,' he says, 'between

\* *Commentarius Criticus Partic. II. p. XLIII. seqq.* † *Ibid. p. LVIII.*

‡ *Hieron. Ep. ad Sunniam et Frëttell.* § *Hier. Præf. in quat. Evāgel.*

the old Syriack version, the old Latin versions, and those ancient Greek manuscripts, which were undoubtedly written in the West, as appears from the Latin translations with which they are accompanied.' 'This wonderful harmony,' he adds, 'between the two most ancient versions of the New Testament, one of which was spread throughout Europe and the North of Africa, the other propagated from Edessa to China, could have had no other cause than a similarity of the Greek manuscripts, in the West of Europe, and the East of Asia, which must have deviated in an equal degree from our printed text, and the manuscripts of what is called the Greek edition.'\* Griesbach allows that this version is nearly related to the Western recension, but contends that it is not actually the same; here again, as elsewhere, having in mind the notion of a standard text.† In his last work he is disposed, for the sake of the Syriack version, to make a new recension, as Michaelis had done before him, calling it the Edessene or Oriental.‡ A revised text, *common* to Syria and to Italy, seems to be out of the question. Yet according to the statements which have been quoted, the same phenomena, which led to the supposition of a revised text as the common basis and bond of any other class of authorities, would lead to its supposition in regard to the Western authorities, the Sahidick version, and the Syriack version. If the phenomena prove nothing in the latter case, they prove nothing in any other.

Respecting the Syriack version, however, the confusion and difficulty are aggravated by Bertholdt; according to whom, it is conformed to the *Byzantine* recension, to the latest supposed text, the critical formation of which is referred to a period subsequent to the time when this version was made. He states this as an important, unanswered difficulty, by which Griesbach's system is embarrassed.§ Such uncertainty about the character and class of this version goes to prove that the character of the supposed classes, with which it is compared, is far from being so well defined, as Bertholdt's own statements, and those of Griesbach and his other followers, would lead us to believe.

\* Marsh's Michaelis, vol. II. p. 27.

† Prolegomena, Sect. III. Comment. Crit. P. II. p. I.

‡ Comment. Crit. *ibid.* § Bertholdt's Introduction, P. I. p. 319.



After what has been alleged, it is only necessary to state briefly, that the notion of such recensions as have been supposed is not only wholly unnecessary to account for the phenomena existing in our present manuscripts, and other authorities for settling the text of the New Testament, but, on the contrary, if the preceding statements are correct, is irreconcilable with these phenomena. It is unsupported by historical evidence; yet it is scarcely credible that we should not have found some, one may say frequent, mention of these recensions in ancient authors, if they actually had been made. But the supposition is not merely unsupported by such evidence; it is inconsistent with those notices respecting the history of the text of the New Testament, which we find in the writers of the first four centuries. The Alexandrine recension, for instance, is supposed to have been formed a little before the time of Origen, and to have been followed by the Alexandrine transcribers, and quoted by the Alexandrine fathers. But of the manuscripts of the New Testament Origen says, 'It is manifest that there is a great difference of copies, partly from the carelessness of some transcribers, partly from the improper liberties taken by others, in altering what they find written,\* and partly because some revisers strike out, or add, according to their own judgment.† The passage seems to afford sufficient proof that there was at this time no standard corrected text at Alexandria, no late Alexandrine recension, which transcribers felt themselves bound to follow. Again, the Byzantine recension is supposed to have been formed somewhat before the time of Chrysostom. Yet according to a passage quoted from him by Scholtz,‡ the most ancient copies were so eagerly sought after, and the sellers of manuscripts were so little disposed to have it thought that their copies were conformed to any new recension, that it was a common fraud to bury manuscripts lately written in a heap of grain, in order so to discolour them, as to give them an appearance of antiquity.

In regard to the three texts, which have been mentioned, Griesbach, as is well known, prefers the authority of the Alexandrine. Eichhorn considers the Western as at once the

\* *Απο τολμης τινων, μοχθηρας της [l. τε] διορθωσης των γραφομενων.*

† Origenes ad Matth. xix. 19.

‡ Page 171.



most ancient and the purest.\* Scholtz admits but two classes of authorities, blending into one, as we have seen, the Western and the Alexandrine, and using the latter as the common name for this class. At the same time, taking quite new ground, he gives the preference to the Byzantine text. 'The internal character,' he says, 'of the Byzantine readings affords decided proof of their genuineness. On this subject I dare appeal to the judgment of competent criticks; and especially of the great Griesbach, who with all his attachment to the Alexandrine manuscripts as the most ancient, yet very seldom follows them.'† The notions of Scholtz do not seem to us clear, nor his arguments satisfactory. But it would require more time and space to state and answer them, than it seems worth while to give. The paradox of preferring the more modern, to the more ancient authorities, is not likely to be readily adopted.

We have, in the preceding remarks, endeavoured to show, that the language, which has been used respecting the differences existing between the text of any one class of authorities, and the text of any other class, or the received text, is in a high degree extravagant; that there seems to be no ground for distinguishing an Alexandrine and a Western text from each other, as characterised by any important peculiarities; and that there is no proof or probability, that the text in common use either in the West of Europe, in Egypt, or in the Byzantine patriarchy, owed its origin to a recension, or critical edition of the New Testament. All our present authorities, it is believed, are to be referred back to the original text, as their nearer or more remote standard, without the intervention of any such recensions as have been supposed. These conclusions seem to us important in regard to the history of the text of the New Testament, and as strengthening our confidence, which the theory of Griesbach is adapted to weaken, in the genuineness and authority of such a corrected text as at the present day we have ample means of forming.

Such a text, generally speaking, Griesbach has himself given us. The rules of criticism, which he has actually followed, rest so little upon his peculiar theory, that the former may

\* Eichhorn's *Einleitung*, &c. i. e. *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. I. p. 675. seqq.

† Page 178.

be overturned without materially affecting the latter. There seems sufficient reason for distinguishing between a Western and an Alexandrine class of authorities, without the supposition of any important peculiarities in the text of either. The true ground for such a distinction is, that the Western and the Alexandrine Christians were so separated from each other by language, by intellectual habits, by difference of country and by other circumstances, that the manuscripts respectively used by either may fairly be considered as forming a distinct class of authorities for settling the text. The same causes of error were not likely to affect both ; the same corruptions were not likely to be found in both. Their agreement, therefore, is of more importance, and tends more strongly to prove the genuineness of the text, than if this ground of distinction did not exist ; than if they were all manuscripts used by Christians more nearly connected with each other. A similar principle of classification, it is obvious, may be still further extended.

Griesbach, indeed, appears sometimes to have been biassed by his peculiar theory ; and we do not agree with him in all his decisions. But he merits, undoubtedly, great praise ; and there is good reason to regard his edition as approximating very nearly the original text, more nearly indeed than, according to some of the passages we have quoted, he himself seems to have apprehended. The labours of Dr. Scholtz in collating new manuscripts, we believe, will be important, generally speaking, not as changing, but as confirming what may at present be regarded as the standard text, the text of Griesbach.

---

ART. VIII.—*An Inquiry into the Comparative Moral Tendency of Trinitarian and Unitarian Doctrines ; in a Series of Letters to the Rev. Dr. Miller, of Princeton.* By JARED SPARKS. Boston. Wells & Lilly.

FIFTEEN years ago, it was a rare thing to meet with a professedly Unitarian work in this country. The more learned and elaborate treatises on the controversy were in the hands of scholars ; but of popular works, explaining and



defending Unitarian doctrines, only a few of Emlyn's tracts, and two or three of the controversial publications of Price and Priestley, were known amongst us, and these not generally.

Unitarianism had indeed existed here for a long time previous, in the minds of the thinking and inquisitive part of the community ; but it had been derived directly from a candid and careful study of the Scriptures, almost the only strictly Unitarian book accessible to the people.

We welcome every effort which is made to supply this deficiency of popular works, friendly to what we regard as the truth, and designed and adapted for general reading. A spirit of inquiry, and a disposition to read upon religious subjects, have been excited in all classes ; which have increased the demand for works of this description, and taught us to look to the press, even more than to the pulpit, as a means of diffusing correct religious principles. We are happy to find that writers of ability from amongst ourselves are beginning to turn their attention to this important object. We certainly have no wish to detract from the merits of several of the publications of the English Unitarians. On some points, however, connected with the controversy, they are known to speculate differently from us ; and the temper and bearing of most of their controversial writings are, likewise, affected by a keen sense of the political wrongs, which they endure as dissenters from the established church, and in which we, of this country, can hardly be expected in all cases to sympathise.

It is, therefore, with great pleasure that we join in recommending Mr. Sparks's *Inquiry into the Comparative Moral Tendency of Trinitarian and Unitarian Doctrines*. It is a book designed and adapted for general reading ; and the topics, and the manner in which they are discussed, are exactly suited to the present state of the Calvinistick controversy in this country. The volume, as we suppose most of our readers are aware, contains a series of Letters originally published in the *Unitarian Miscellany* ; but they are here brought together with many important additions and alterations, such as were necessary to clothe them with a general interest, and make them harmonise in promoting the author's main purpose in writing. Something is unquestionably lost, in regard to arrangement and symmetry, in consequence of



the disconnected manner in which these Letters were first given to the world ; but something also is gained from the same cause, as it led the writer to bestow a more distinct and concentrated attention upon some of the more important topics, that came under his consideration. As an example of this, we might refer to his Letters on the *Sentiments and Morals of Celebrated English Unitarians* ; and, also, to his admirable Letters on the *Atonement*, containing by far the best popular treatise on this difficult and delicate subject, which we remember to have seen.

As to its general execution it is enough to say, and no more than the truth, that this work is in all respects worthy of the character and reputation of its author. The point, moreover, on which the whole argument is made to turn in this book, is that which must, after all, decide the controversy with the bulk of mankind ;—namely, the comparative moral tendency of the two conflicting systems. The learned and curious may perplex themselves with metaphysical distinctions, and philological refinements, and historical and antiquarian researches ; may frame their theories, and run out their inferences, and talk of their orthodoxy and their heterodoxy ; but the great body of the people have no time, taste, nor abilities, for discussions of this nature ; nor will they suffer themselves to be made a party to the disputes founded on them, unless inveigled into it by their spiritual guides. So far as they are wise and independent of party influences, and so far as they dare think and judge for themselves, they will uniformly declare themselves in favour of that system, which they can understand, and which, while it may be plainly shown to be accordant to the obvious tenour of Scripture, and the acknowledged design of the Gospel, approves itself also to their consciences and their common sense, as most conducive to pure morals, a charitable disposition, and practical piety.

If this work had not been so long before the publick in two distinct forms, we might enter more particularly into its merits, and illustrate our remarks by the citation of some of its more striking passages. As it is, it only remains for us to recommend it warmly to all Unitarians who read, assuring them that it will resolve their doubts on several important points much agitated at the present day, and afford them a degree of information and satisfaction respecting some views of their

faith, not likely to be obtained from any other quarter. Unitarians should also consider, that professing, as they do, to be a reading and inquiring sect, to include a larger than usual proportion of intelligent and thinking men in their number, and to hold views which only require to be stated and explained, in order to be clearly apprehended even by common minds, a neglect to avail themselves of the means to understand the nature and grounds of their religious principles, is more inconsistent and more inexcusable in them, than it would be in any other denomination of Christians.

---

ART. IX.—*Regular Hymns, on a great Variety of Evangelical Subjects, and important Occasions, with Musical Directions, for all the Varieties of appropriate Expression.* By SAMUEL WILLARD, A. A. S. Greenfield. 1824.

THIS is a work for many reasons singularly deserving of attention. It contains one hundred and fifty eight original hymns, composed by the same author, for the purpose of illustrating a new and important theory, which may effect a better alliance between sacred poetry and sacred musick. It is in every sense original; in plan and principle, as well as in composition; and could only be the result of great zeal and industry. It is designed to point out the defects and errors which render psalmody so little efficacious, and to suggest a remedy. Mr. Willard deserves the thanks of the religious community for exciting attention toward them; and, although we fear that few will be brought to such a deep consideration of the subject as to feel its importance as he does, or as we do; yet we are persuaded that merely to agitate and discuss the topick, must have an influence, small, perhaps, yet real, toward producing a correct sentiment, and thus alleviating, if not correcting, the evils which exist. We gladly avail ourselves of this opportunity to aid the design. We shall pretend to little more than to repeat the considerations, which the author has urged, with such further illustrations as have occurred to us; persuaded that nothing more than a fair statement is needed to make the principles in question understood and approved.



The purpose of language is the communication of thought and the excitement of feeling. Words alone are capable of doing this ; but the degree in which they do it must depend on the manner in which they are uttered. The same words may communicate thought very coldly or very vividly. The same sentence will excite feeling very strongly, or not at all, according to the tone in which it is spoken, and the attitude and look which accompany it. This is familiarly known. Whitefield is said to have overwhelmed an audience in tears by the manner in which, on a certain occasion, he repeated the few words, *you do not know yourselves* ; words which are every day uttered without any impression. So much depends upon tone. The tone indeed seems to be the key to the emotions. Feeling is in no way so easily excited as through the ear. The sudden cry of fire startles us far more than the sight of the flame ; and the scream of distress or long drawn groan of agony, engages sympathy beyond comparison more than the mere sight of the painful struggle.\*

Without the essential aid of emphasis, pause, and tone, language becomes a feeble and inefficient instrument. When these are employed in their true and legitimate use, there is scarcely a conceivable limit to its power. Of this the whole history of rhetorick and eloquence may convince us.

Not, however, that these are all. There is much to aid this effect in what is called style ; that is, in the choice, but especially the arrangement, of words, and the melody of sentences. The ear discerns and loves the musick of harmonious periods, and the mind is attracted to the thought while the sense is won by the sound.

Hence arises the charm of verse, which is only the more artificial and musical arrangement of accents and pauses. By the adjustment of these, according to certain prescribed rules of harmonious modulation, a combination and succession of rhythms is effected, which has in all ages been a source of the highest gratification to the human mind. To the perfect reading of poetry, a more exquisite grace in pronunciation, and more faithful obedience to emphasis, pause, and tone, are required, than in the reading of prose. The most musical verse may be deprived of all its charms by the unskilfulness

\* See a late pamphlet of Professor Porter.



of an incompetent reader. But when recited agreeably to the laws by which it is constructed, it may charm the attention and stir the feelings, though it be of very barren merit. When Virgil asked a friend what he thought of some verses, which he had just read; 'They may be nonsense, for aught I know,' he replied; 'for your manner of reading has bewitched me.'

Oratory and poetry are thus powerful through the combined influence of sentiment and sound. Their sister art, musick, owes her power to sound alone. But through the skilful combination and succession of tones the most various emotions may be excited, and the spirits either animated or quieted, elevated or depressed. But here again, as in the other cases, the effect will depend on a tasteful observance of the fundamental and unchangeable laws of musick; since the most affecting composition may become tedious and grating, when performed by an incompetent hand, and what is really indifferent in itself, may receive beauty and spirit from the magick touch of a real master.

Poetry and musick are adapted to each other. They are constructed upon principles of successive accents and regulated pauses, which coincide with each other, and render them capable of a natural and intimate alliance. Their regular movements are similar and coincident. Their legitimate accents and pauses occur at similar intervals, and form similar modulations. Yet both in poetry and in musick there are exceptions to these rules, and they are exceptions of a similar nature. It is most plain, therefore, that in combining them together, nothing should be suffered which would destroy the effect of their natural adaptation; that is to say, that irregularities of modulation in the one should never be united to the regular modulation of the other; since this would be so far from answering the purpose designed by their union, that it would necessarily defeat it. The effect of the verse depends upon an exact observance of its rhythmical cadences and pauses; let these be neglected, and it becomes prose. If a reader neglect them, his reading is thought insufferable. The effect must be equally bad, if the singer neglect them; and certainly not less so, if they be applied to a tune, whose rhythmical cadences are so differently arranged, as to compel the performer to torture the verse into an unnatural modulation. The finest poetry may be thus made unmeaning and unattrac-

tive ; that wonderful charm, which sweet verse possesses, disappears ; the emotions which spring up from the beauty of the sentiment and the melody of the language, are gone ; nothing remains but the musick, and that is mere sound without sense ; it has become, as Mr. Willard very truly says, only instrumental music ; and the human voice divine, made to thrill the inmost soul, has degenerated into a material pipe, whose sounds die in the ear, and touch only the animal man.

We deny nothing of the charm of instrumental musick, and are fully aware that we are greatly affected by even sound without sense. But the greater the power of musical sounds alone, the greater will be their power when skilfully combined with intelligible language ; and the greater therefore the necessity of care so to combine them as not to destroy that sentiment by the musick, which the musick is intended to aid. Combine these rightly, let the sentimental character of each be the same, and the rhythmical modulation the same, and the pauses of the verse, the sense, and the tune, all coincident ; and each aids the impression of the other. The ear and the understanding are alike won ; the impressions on the bodily organ and on the feelings of the heart, are alike strong, and the material and intellectual man bow together before the united spell. Since musick can touch and overcome the feelings when alone, what might it not accomplish when thus ' married to immortal verse ? ' And since written or recited verse can rouse and agitate the soul by its harmonious eloquence, what addition to its power might not be expected from its exact union with that mysterious melody, which, even unconnected with sentiment, is little less than omnipotent ?

But reasonable and sound as we are persuaded these observations are, and perfectly warranted by all that we know of the natural qualities of both these arts ; we are aware that they may seem to be contradicted by experience. For where, it will be asked, do we find in fact, that the power or charm of either is very greatly increased by its union with the other ? It is rarely that we are more excited by the singing than by the reading of an animated ode ; or that we increase the attractions of a favourite air, by adding to it the sentiment of a song. This will be especially alleged in the case of sacred musick. When one considers the nature of the interesting and sublime truths upon which our hymns are composed, the sacred and



deep feelings which they address, the beauty and force of the verse in which many are written, and the grandeur of the harmony in which they are frequently sung ; it seems difficult to account for the apathy with which the musick of publick worship is listened to, and the very slight effect it is seen to produce. Our theories of the efficacy of united musick and poetry seem to be overthrown, and we should suspect that each paralyzed and neutralized instead of aiding the other.

It appears to us that there are various causes which will account for this, without bringing into doubt the power of vocal musick ; some of them susceptible of a remedy, and some, it is to be feared, hopeless of all cure. In the first place, the singing in our churches is, for the most part, a matter of mere mechanical execution, in which nothing more is attempted or thought of, than to sound the several notes of the tune. To adapt the tune to the sentiment of the hymn, and to vary it with the varying feelings and pauses of the several verses, is but a secondary object. So that if the verses themselves are calculated to excite emotion, that emotion is checked and repressed by the uniform unaccommodating movement of the notes to which they are fettered.

This difficulty is in part owing to the inflexible character of our psalmody. Our best tunes move forward with a solemn air and dignified tread, which render them unsuitable to the expression of various sentiments. A single performer of genius and ability, might indeed, by those licenses, of which such a one knows how to avail himself, cause the most inflexible to bend in accommodation to the verse, as is familiarly done in the singing of profane songs. But this cannot be expected of a whole choir, who must move in exact accordance with each other, and are therefore forbidden all movements *ad libitum*. This they might remedy in a single hymn, or a few hymns, by frequently rehearsing them together, as they would rehearse the chorus of an oratorio. But it is impracticable in regard to the musick of every Sabbath, where the same hymn infrequently occurs, and the tunes must necessarily be selected and adapted almost extempore.\*

\* A partial remedy for this evil is provided in the following suggestion from our author's preface. 'The chorister should sit down at *home*, and by a careful examination of the form and sentiment of each hymn, and of the character of the musick in every part, endeavour to select, and affix to the hymn such a tune, as in every view will do it the greatest justice.'



While there is this difficulty on the part of the tunes, there is one of a similar nature on the part of the hymns. They have been constructed with too little regard to the purpose for which they are designed. They have been too generally made to be *read* rather than to be sung. They conform to the rules of poetical composition, but their musical adaptation has been disregarded. Now lyric poetry is distinguished from all other in this particular, that it is to be combined with musick. This constitutes its essential characteristic. It should seem, therefore, an obvious and essential requisition, that the laws of poetick harmony should be modified by the laws of musical harmony ; and that all licenses in verse should be avoided, which are not equally allowable in musick. Otherwise it is plain that there may be an interference between the rhythm of the stanza and that of the tune, which shall destroy the effect of both. This is so obvious, that it has been always regarded by the best writers of songs, though it has strangely escaped the observation of our sacred poets.—A hymn is divided into several stanzas. Each stanza may be formed in perfect compliance with the rules of composition, and yet differ from each of the others in the adjustment of the accents, the emphases, and the pauses. But each is to be sung to the same tune, and therefore in singing must be forced into the same accents, emphases, and pauses. What can be imagined more ruinous to the true effect of the composition than this? Who would bear to hear it tortured by a *reader* in this schoolboy style? Yet this is not the fault of the musick or of the singer, but of the poet, who should have cast all his stanzas in the same mould, and then the same tune would have fitted each. In this particular Watts' fine version of the hundredth psalm is faulty, and may serve as an illustration of our meaning. The accents fall differently in nearly every stanza ; so that if you find a tune whose accents conform to the first, it is sure to mar the beauty of every other. A composer of musick, who should select these words for an anthem, would scrupulously conform to all these varieties and changes of metre. He could not otherwise produce the effect he should intend. Madan, in his Denmark, has accordingly done this ; and the popularity of that piece proves how different is the spirit of these lines, when their varying accents, emphases, and pauses, are all brought forward and

favoured, from what it is when dragged along in the monotonous alternation of regular accents.

Precisely in the same way, when a poet is composing verses for some particular tune, he accommodates himself entirely to the movements of the tune ; well knowing that his lines will lose their meaning and zest in singing, if they be not thus fitted to the sounds in which they are to be conveyed.

Now in these instances a principle of adaptation is acknowledged and acted upon, as essential to musical effect, which is for the most part neglected in common psalmody ; but which is necessary in order to render this exercise of publick worship all which it should be. It is this for which Mr. Willard contends ; and as every separate hymn cannot, of course, be set to its own peculiar musick, it becomes important that the stanzas be fashioned in such conformity with each other, as to render some one tune equally suitable to each. The two following stanzas of Cowper present a happy example of this just uniformity.

A glory gilds the sacred page,  
Majestick as the sun ;  
It gives a light to every age,  
It gives—but borrows none.

The hand that gave it, still supplies  
The gracious light and heat ;  
Its truths upon the nations rise,  
They rise—but never set.

No one can fail to observe the effect that may be given to these verses by a tune, which should express the pause in the last line. But if the succeeding stanza have no such pause, the sense would be as much injured there as it is here assisted. Thus :

With steadfast zeal may we pursue  
The paths of truth and love ;  
Till glory break upon our view,  
In bright—er worlds above.

Yet such is the construction of our sacred odes, that absurdities like this are of not infrequent occurrence. A smile has often been excited at the story, which is told to show how ridiculous was the ancient method of reading hymns line by line. In a psalm of the old version the first line ran, *The*

*Lord will come, and he will not ;* which having been duly sung, the second was read, *Keep silence, but speak out.* But a large majority of the tunes, which might be selected at the present day, would give to these lines precisely the same absurd turn. Examples of the same sort, though not so glaring, are quite common ; the contradictory adjustment of pauses disturbing the sense, if not destroying it. It will be difficult to find a tune, whose pauses shall not ruin the following stanza.

Author of good ! to thee I turn ;  
Thy ever watchful eye  
Alone, can all my wants discern,  
Thy hands alone supply.

All our tunes have a pause, sufficient to express a semicolon, at the end of the second line ; which of course turns to nonsense this beautiful verse. For a similar reason we never have this stanza sung according to the sense ;

Now to the God, whose power in heav'n  
And earth, has works of wonder done,  
Be everlasting honours giv'n  
By all the church, through Christ his son.

There are two sorts of six line stanzas among our hymns in long metre, the one having pauses with the rhymes at the end of the second, fourth, and sixth lines ; and the other having pauses at the end of the third and sixth lines. There are also two sorts of tunes with corresponding pauses ; and we are sometimes so unfortunate as to find them misapplied, so as to give us readings like these ;

From night to day, from day to night,  
The dawning and the dying light :  
Lectures of heavenly wisdom read,  
With silent eloquence they raise :  
Our thoughts to our Creator's praise,  
And neither sound nor language need.

Thou art, O God, the life and light,  
Of all this wondrous world we see,  
Its glow by day, its smile by night :  
Are but reflections caught from thee,  
Where'er we turn thy glories shine,  
And all things bright and fair are thine.



Who can wonder at the little power of sacred musick, when we are so frequently liable to have the finest hymns thus rendered vapid and unmeaning? They are strong examples which we have given, but the evil is great even when found in slighter instances. Many a beautiful psalm has been ruined and the whole sentiment destroyed, by the break in the third line of Arundel. It is a fine tune, but utterly unsuited to our ordinary stanza. It needs a stanza of a peculiar structure; and it will prove better than words how much may be effected by a proper adaptation, to cite one of the excellent hymns, which Mr. Willard has expressly composed for it.

*An Evening Hymn.*

Far from the world we now retire,  
And raise our eyes to God,  
Who in his love—Smiles from above,  
And cheers our dark abode.

Author of all the countless worlds,  
The vault of heav'n displays,  
Aw'd by thy power—Thee we adore,  
And chant our ev'ning lays.

Under those eyes, which never close,  
We lay us down to sleep;  
Hearer of prayer—Make us thy care,  
And safe our slumbers keep.

Soon as the sun with new-born rays,  
Re-lumes the eastern skies,  
Source of all light—Beam on our sight,  
And bless our waking eyes.

We add also a peculiar stanza adapted to Blendon.

Infinite God—thy glorious name—  
Let earth and heav'n—with joy proclaim;  
Angels and men—Join in the strain,  
Chanting aloud the rapt'rous theme.

In the same manner the following is adapted to Psalm 97.

Great is the Lord—his name adore  
Angels and spirits—round his throne;  
Wide he extends his sovereign power,  
And claims our praise—as God alone.

It is undoubtedly then, the want of suitable adaptation, which is the great cause why sacred musick is so uninteresting and

unmoving ; the neglect of uniting tunes and hymns according to those fundamental principles of rhythm, alluded to in a preceding paragraph, by which nature has accommodated them to each other, and by the neglect of which they are disjoined. It is to this subject that Mr. Willard has principally directed his attention in the present publication, and for the sake of illustrating which, he has written his *Regular Hymns*. In what sense they are *regular*, may be perceived from the course of our remarks, and from the specimens we have just quoted. 'The design is,' he says, 'that all the several stanzas of the same hymn be formed, as far as possible, on the same model ; so that any tune, which harmonizes with the verbal expressions of one verse, may, in point of rhythm and emphasis, be equally suited to every other verse.' The following extracts from the Preface, will more fully explain his object and feelings.

'If the powers of verbal expression are to be aided by those of musick, it is evident from universal analogy, that these different powers must act in *concert*, and not in *opposition* to each other ; that the musick should render emphatical words still *more* emphatical, and avoid giving any undue importance to those words and syllables, which, in good reading, would be sunk into obscurity. This principle is in the nature of things so obvious, that the author would have thought it needless, and almost *indecorous*, to say thus much upon it, had not the Christian publick in general been so long insensible to it. From the want of symmetry in our common psalmody, scarcely any thing is more frequent, than the most flagrant violation of this principle. The name of *God*, of *heaven*, or *hell*, for instance, is often sunk, in the musical performance, to the lowest degree of *insignificance* ; is skipped over with a degree of levity almost profane ; while in a moment, perhaps, an *a*, an *is*, a *to*, an *and*, or some other insect word, is swelled into a bombastick and stupid importance. In tunes, consisting of notes or phrases of equal length, like those of *Old Hundred*, *Windsor*, or *Bethesda*, the emphases and accents of the musick might, in the performance, be accommodated to those of the language. Such accommodations however, being exceptions to the general and natural laws of musick, no ordinary choir can long be made to observe them. Where the notes are of an *unequal* length, like those of *Mear*, or of the fifth line of *Springfield* or *Brattle-street*, a musician of the greatest skill and taste can do little more, than to show an awkward reluctance in yielding to the claims of these petty, but irresistible tyrants, *a* and *the* with their pigmy confederates.



‘ A remedy for the evil, here exposed, has long employed the thoughts of the author. Whether it be from a *morbid*, or a *healthful* sensibility, others of course will judge ; but so it is,

“ His ear is pain’d, his soul is sick,”

with such perpetual contradictions between sound and sense ; with such incorrigible jargon between the melodious, the angelick voices of the two sister arts, poetry and musick ; whose united powers could work any thing short of moral miracles ; whose contradictory efforts can work *nothing* but apathy or distraction.

‘ From these unnatural hostilities between rhetorick and musick, the singer is apt to fall into the neglect of that *accent* or *emphasis*, which gives to musick all its *elasticity*, and of course most of its energy and grace. As the accents cannot be regular, without often becoming insipid and ridiculous, he is discouraged from *attempting* any, and proceeds through every musical scene, with that *leaden* step, which is a weariness to himself, and to every one present. To the same source may be traced that neglect of *articulation*, which almost every where paralyzes the very soul of musick. As from unhappy experience the author can attest, a *blind* man, who of course can derive no aid from a book, may sometimes give the most laborious attention, from the beginning to the end of a hymn, without being enabled by the mutilated or smothered pronunciation, even to *guess* out a single sentiment. And, when the musick ceases to be vocal, in every thing but the name, it is no wonder, that there should be such a want, or perversion of *appropriate expression*, as at one time *dissipates*, and at another *freezes* the current of devout affection.’ pp. 3, 4.

‘ Many may be disposed to excuse themselves from an active concurrence in the leading design of this publication, on the supposition, that they have not a natural ear for musick, and of course that they are not qualified to form any judgment on the subject. But I will hazard the prediction, that if this design should be carried into effect, many of these will find to their happy surprise that they *have* an ear for *real* musick, though not for that, which is spurious, or essentially defective. If they cannot enjoy the *harmony* of *different* parts, they may have a relish for the *melody* of some *one* part, to which their attention is particularly attracted ; especially when it moves in sweet accordance with the poetical expression of interesting thoughts.

‘ This is not mere conjecture. I have known several persons, who *professed* and *appeared* to feel in a very lively manner the melody of a single part, without a capacity for enjoying the concord of *several* parts ; and I am much inclined to think that these faculties are so independent of each other, that such persons may enjoy, in as high a degree as others, that harmony, which ought to subsist



between each individual part, and the sentiments it is to enforce. If this be any thing more than a chimera, how *much* are those concerned in the subject, who are apt to think they have *no* interest in it! The proposed improvement might, perhaps, open to them scenes of pleasure, of which they have scarcely had a glimpse. Those seasons, which are now little better than *blanks* in holy time and holy employments, might become seasons of pure delight and lasting improvement. The expression of sentiment, even to those who have an ear for harmony, depends chiefly on the *melody* of the *individual* parts; and if the author may be indulged in a little egotism, he can say from his own experience, that a person in *solitude* and *silence*, by merely tracing with his eye and his imagination a happy coincidence between a succession of sounds and the sentiments they accompany, may work himself up to a degree of feeling, much superiour to that, which can be produced by the best performance of any ordinary choir.' pp. 8, 9.

We are persuaded that a more reasonable and self evident proposition, than the main position of our author, can hardly be stated. The rhythmical movements of verse and of musick have, as we have said, a natural suitableness to each other. The common time in musick, for example, exactly expresses the ordinary iambick feet; and the treble time is a precise representation of the anapæstick or dactylick feet. Consequently, when the verse is perfectly regular its accents fall in with those of the musick, and there is an entire correspondence of sound and sense. The two following lines, for example, move in exact accordance with the measure of *Old Hundred*.

Before Jehovah's awful throne,  
Ye nations bow with sacred joy.

But in the next lines of the stanza, we find a discordance between the poetick and musical accent, the tune torturing the trochees which begin the lines into iambuses.

Know that the Lord is God alone,  
He can create, and he destroy.

The consequence of this movement, however indifferent to it we may have become through habit, unquestionably is to destroy the spirit and meaning of the verse.

Now as most tunes are thus perfectly regular, it is surely asking very little of the poet, that he should make his hymns perfectly regular also. He may think, perhaps, that this will destroy that occasional variety in the rhythm which is necessary to prevent that tediousness, which has been complained

of as the tendency of iambick measure, and which Hunt has ridiculed as

‘Cuckoo-song verses, one up and one down.’

This certainly is a reason for seeking every allowable variety in a long poem ; but in a hymn, which contains but sixteen or twenty four lines, there is not the slightest occasion for this apprehension. Indeed, several of the best and favourite hymns are thus constructed, and no one has dreamed of complaining. ‘Did any one,’ asks Mr. Willard, ‘ever think of objecting to the 133d psalm, S. M. in *Watts*, or the 91st psalm in *Belknap*, or Hawksworth’s morning hymn, or Miss Williams’s hymn on habitual devotion, or the 43d, 200dth, or 250th hymn in the New York Collection, that most of the verses are perfectly regular ?’ And if they were not so, they would be made so by the tunes to which they should be set. Let the most graceful variety be given to the stanzas, which the writer can devise, it is all done away in the singing, for the tune has not and cannot have this variety. Is it not better then to frame the stanzas alike at first, that in the performance they may be sung according to the measure, than to seek a variety which the performance inevitably violates into a forced, unnatural, vexatious sameness ?

A true poet, who has accustomed himself to the restraint of certain measures, can conform to one as well as to another. It will be nothing to him, in writing an ode of six stanzas, that he is abridged of the liberty of a trochee now and then. As we have observed before, the best writers of songs have accommodated themselves to the principles here stated ; and every one knows with what graceful ease Moore moves on under the constraint of the most novel and arbitrary measures. Gray, also, though he adopted the most arbitrary and artificial succession of verses, appears to have lost nothing of his freedom and fire, from the additional restraints thus imposed upon him. His Pindarick Odes, sometimes accounted so lawless, are subject to laws as severe and embarrassing, to say the least, as the one under consideration. The corresponding stanzas of each ternary are cast in the same mould, and capable of expression by the same musick. It cannot therefore be a very great inconvenience to the writer of hymns, to support this uniformity of structure. When song writers have not done this, the musical composers have showed their



sense of the importance of the principle, by varying the notes of their tunes to correspond to the licenses of the different verses; as may be seen in many of the engraved songs.\* Where this is not done, the truly expressive singer takes the license, which has not been given, and by the dictate of his own good taste bends the musick in conformity to the verse. What are all these but practical illustrations of the soundness and value of our author's theory? As it is not possible that the hymn tunes should be written with these accommodating variations, nor that any choir should be possessed of taste and judgment to make these variations spontaneously, at a moment's warning, without previous consultation; therefore our author would lay the burden upon the writer of the hymns. There the remedy would be more effectual and complete, than could be hoped for in any other way.

We have not room to pursue the subject further, or to add the numerous particular illustrations which we had prepared;† much less to go on to an examination of the other principles and rules, which are laid down in the very sensible and valuable preface to this publication. It is one principal object, besides that which we have named, to urge the importance of musical expression, of singing according to the meaning and sentiment of the verse. This is a point worthy of attentive consideration; and we hope the observations of our author will not be without their effect. How far the marks, which are adopted as mechanical guides, may answer the purpose designed, we are unable to judge. There is reason to believe, however, that under the direction of an intelligent and serious chorister, they might prove a most essential aid toward calling forth that expression, wherein consists the power and soul of psalmody.

\* 'Any infringement, in practice, upon metrical symmetry, is a rhythmical blemish, always more or less offensive to an orderly ear.' 'We have heard more than one musical composer utter bitter complaints against these latitudinarian principles in matters of rhythm, of which musick is always a sure and severe test. After devising a proper rhythm for one line, the composer finds it will not fit its seeming companion; and when, by dint of cutting or stretching, like Procrustes, he at last gets the better of one stanza, he finds to his vexation that the musick will not fit the next; various little alterations are necessary, sufficient however to render it requisite to write the musick of the second, and perhaps the third stanzas, and to oblige the publick to pay for the metrical peccadillos of the poet.'—*New Monthly Magazine*, No. XXVIII. p. 306.

† Some further remarks on this subject may be seen in the *Christian Disciple*, vol. IV. p. 281.



The hymns in this little volume are all of course framed by the principles which the author advocates, and are accompanied by directions for the manner in which every part is to be performed. A careful examination of them would do more than any thing else to satisfy those who doubt of the practicability of the plan, and to remove objections respecting its inconveniences. The hymns are on a great variety of subjects, so composed and arranged, 'as to furnish, as far as possible, a complete system of Christian doctrines and principles, so far as they appear to be connected with the exercises of devotion.' The author has endeavoured, he tells us, and not unsuccessfully,

'To draw the *Christian portrait* in all its fair proportions and appropriate graces ; and it is hoped, that the divine original is not so much disfigured, either by the drawing, or the colouring, as not to have some charms for the eyes of the young ; for the rising members of the Christian family. If any of the subjects are treated according to their merits, there is doubtless a great inequality in different hymns, for which the author begs the candid indulgence of the publick. At the same time he trusts, they will do him the justice of remembering, that many important subjects are in their nature so humble and plain, as not to admit a very lofty flight, or delicate touch. To recur to the figure, which I hope has not been already pursued too far, it were unreasonable to expect in a *foot*, or a *finger*, however necessary to complete the portrait, all the majesty or grace of an *eye*.' p. 16.

The variety of metre is as great, and there is as little of monotony in the construction, as in any collection of the same extent. One peculiarity is the frequent introduction of the dactylick or anapæstic measure ; which, however difficult it may be to read, is singularly well adapted to distinct and expressive singing. We have given some extracts as illustrations of the theory ; we will find room for one more as a specimen of the correct judgment and good style of the poetry.

My weakness, Lord—and wants I feel ;  
Thine all sufficient grace reveal ;  
Conduct me safe in wisdom's way,  
And ne'er permit my feet to stray.

Unclose mine eyes—to read thy word,  
The word of life and comfort, Lord ;  
Through every page diffuse thy light,  
To guide my understanding right.

Temptations still beset me round,  
T' ensnare my feet—my heart to wound ;  
Protect me then from every harm,  
And ev'ry threat'ning foe disarm.

In all the various paths I tread,  
Be sin and folly all my dread ;  
Thy service, Lord, my chief employ ;  
Thy gracious smiles my highest joy.

---

ART. X.—1. *An Apology for the Pursuit of Final Beatitude, independently of Brahmunicipal Observances.* By RAM-MOHUN ROY. Calcutta. 1820.

2. *Dialogue between Bidhaok and Nissedok.*

3. *A Vindication of the Incarnation of the Deity, as the common Basis of Hindooism and Christianity, against the Schismatick Attacks of R. Tytler, Esq. M. D.* By RAM DOSS. Calcutta. 1823.

4. *The Brahmunicipal Magazine. Four Numbers.* By SHIVU-PRUSAD SURMA. Calcutta. 1823.

5. *Unitarian Repository and Christian Miscellany. Prospectus and four Numbers.* Calcutta. 1823.

A LATE arrival from Calcutta added the works above named to our collection of Indian polemical writings. The *Apology* is very short, and without any special interest for cisatlantick readers. The *Dialogue* is a reply to a work of Rammohun Roy, in which he had maintained the custom of the suicide of widows to be unauthorized by the Vedas. We do not perceive that the reasonings of Rammohun Roy to this point are invalidated, but the language in the authorities cited is so obscure, that very probably we do not apprehend its force.

The *Vindication* is a very singular production. It consists of a correspondence between an English gentleman and *Ram Doss*, a Hindoo. It is, as its title purports, an argument on the part of the latter, who professes to be religiously attached to the idolatry of his nation, to prove the theology of Hindoos and of Trinitarian Christians to be essentially the

same. In his 'Dedication to all Believers in the Incarnation of the Deity,' he states his object to have been that they all, 'whether Hindoos or Christians, might unite in support of [their] common cause, and cordially cooperate in [their] endeavours to check the alarming growth of the Unitarian heresy.'

In his first letter to Dr. Tytler, Ram Doss argues,

'Since God can be born of the tribe of Judah, how, I ask, is it impossible that he should be born of the tribe of Rughoo, or of any other nation or race of men?—You may perhaps urge, that there is a wide difference between a belief in *three* persons in the Godhead, as maintained by you, and a belief in three hundred and thirty millions of persons in the Godhead, entertained by the Hindoos. But as all such numerical objections are founded on the frail basis of human reason, which we well know is fallible, you must admit that the same omnipotence, which can make *Three One and One Three*, can equally reconcile the *unity* and *plurality* of three hundred and thirty millions, both being supported by a sublime mystery, which far transcends all human comprehension.

'The vain and narrow minded believers in *one Invisible God* accuse the followers of the Trinity, as well as us, the sincere worshippers of Ram and other Divine Incarnations, of being Idolaters; and policy therefore might have suggested to you the propriety of maintaining a good understanding and brotherhood among all who have correct notions of the manifestation of God in the flesh, that we may cordially join, and go hand in hand in opposing, and, if possible, extirpating the abominable notion of a *single God*, which strikes equally at the root of Hindooism and Christianity. However, it is not too late for you to reflect on your indiscretion, and atone for it, by expressing your regret at having written and published any thing calculated to create dissension among the worshippers of Divine Incarnations.'

A part of the series of the *Brahmunical Magazine*, above named, consists of a second edition of three numbers of that work, of which some account was given in the *Christian Disciple*, Vol. V. No. 5. To this republication, the editor says in the preface, which is new,

'I was influenced by the conviction that persons, who travel to a distant country for the purpose of overturning the opinions of its inhabitants and introducing their own, ought to be prepared to demonstrate that the latter are more reasonable than the former.

'In conclusion, I beg to ask every candid and reflecting reader; whether a man be placed on an imperial throne or sit in the dust,



whether he be Lord of the whole known world, or destitute of even a hut; the commander of millions, or without a single follower; whether he be intimately acquainted with all human learning, or ignorant of letters; whether he be ruddy and handsome, or dark and deformed; yet if, while he declares that God is not man, he again professes to believe in a God Man or Man God, under whatever sophistry the idea may be sheltered, can such a person have a just claim to enjoy respect in the intellectual world? and does he not expose himself to censure, should he, at the same time, ascribe unreasonableness to others?'

The fourth number of the *Brahmunicipal Magazine* is composed of two chapters. The first is entitled *A Reply to certain Queries directed against the Vedant* by the Baptist missionaries. The following passage shows how Hindoos retort upon orthodox Christians the charge brought against their theology, as being gross and unreasonable.

'I do not wonder, that our religious principles are compared with those of atheists, by one, whose ideas of the divine nature are so gross, that he can consider God, as having been born and circumcised, as having grown and been subject to parental authority, as eating and drinking, and even as dying, and as having been totally annihilated; (though for three days only, the period intervening from the crucifixion of Christ to his resurrection;) nor can it give me any concern, if a person, labouring under such extravagant fancies, should at the same time insinuate atheism against us; since he must thereby only expose himself to the derision of the discerning publick.' pp. 5, 6.

The second chapter is entitled *Reasons of a Hindoo for rejecting the Doctrines of Christianity*. These reasons are found in the pseudo-Christian doctrines of the Trinity and vicarious satisfaction.

'I regret,' says the editor, 'that, notwithstanding very great mental exertions, I am unable to attain a comprehension of this creed.'

'These Missionary Gentlemen have come out to this country in the expectation, that grown men should first give up the use of their external senses; and should profess seriously, that although the Father is *one God*, and the Son is *one God*, and the Holy Ghost is *one God*, yet that the number of Gods does not exceed *one*; a doctrine which, although unintelligible to others, having been imbibed by these pious men with their mothers' milk is of course as familiar to them, as the idea of the animation of the stony goddess

“Kalee” is to an idolatrous Hindoo, by whom it has, in like manner, been acquired in his infancy.’ pp. 11, 12.

The incredibility of both these doctrines is exposed in a strain of able reasoning and animated expostulation. In the course of the remarks an enumeration is given of the contradictory representations of several well known orthodox divines of England. The list is concluded by a theory, new to us, of Dr. Heber, the newly consecrated bishop of Calcutta, who, it seems, ‘maintains that the second and third persons in the trinity are no other than the angels Michael and Gabriel.’ Upon this it is remarked,

‘The theory of the Godhead proposed by this pious and learned Prelate, although it is at variance with the opinions of several other Divines, must yet be gratifying to Hindoo Theologians, who have long cherished the doctrine of the Metempsychosis, or the transmigration of spirits from one body to another. Since the belief in the second person of the Godhead, originally a mere spirit, taking, at one time, according to this theory, the form of an *angel*, (Michael,) and afterwards assuming the body of *man*, (Jesus Christ,) by means of natural birth, which was effected, as is said, by the Virgin Mary and the angel Gabriel, countenances the doctrine of the migration of spirits from the bodies of superiour to those of inferior creatures.’ pp. 15, 16.

Upon the hopefulness of a cause, embarrassed by such dogmas, it is said,

‘As to their attempts at the converting of Hindoos to the Christian faith, these teachers of strange doctrines may now have been convinced by experience, after the exertions of a quarter of a century, that no grown up native of India, possessed of common sense and common honesty, will ever be persuaded to believe in their self contradictory creed.’ pp. 24, 25.

We suppose the editor of the *Unitarian Repository and Christian Miscellany*, to be Rev. Mr. Adam, the gentleman whose change of religious sentiments caused him, three years since, to detach himself from the Baptist mission. This publication was begun last October. Four numbers have been received. The three first consist but of eight pages each; but before the publication of the fourth number, sufficient patronage had been afforded to justify its being increased to sixteen. It is a work adapted to popular use, and has hitherto been chiefly composed of extracts from American and English works.



The object is stated to be 'to diffuse as widely as possible, a spirit of rational piety, and of enlightened benevolence ; and in particular to communicate correct and interesting information respecting the past history and present state of Christianity, in all its forms, throughout the world.'

An arrival, more recent than that by which we received the works named at the head of this article, placed us also in possession of a detailed reply by Mr. Adam to a series of questions addressed to him from this country, relating to the condition and prospects of Christianity in India. A manuscript communication from Rammohun Roy, on the same subject, had been previously received. We are happy to learn that these writings are about to be given to the American publick. They will be found to contain a great amount of authentick information on a deeply interesting subject.

It may interest some of our readers to know, that by a vessel which sailed for Calcutta a few days after the last advices from that place, the sum of \$375, furnished by a few friends, was remitted to Mr. Adam.

---

## Intelligence.

*American Bible Society.*—The eighth anniversary of this Society was celebrated in New York, on Thursday, May 13. From the Annual Report of the state of the treasury it appears that the receipts of the eighth year amounted to \$42,496 95. This is \$6,280 95 more than the receipts of the preceding year. 34,000 bibles and 42,875 testaments have been printed at the Society's depository during the last year. A donation of 350 bibles and testaments in foreign languages has been received from the British and Foreign Bible Society.

The whole amount of bibles and testaments and parts of the latter, that have been printed or otherwise obtained for circulation, within eight years, is 403,352. The number of bibles that have been issued during the past year is 31,590, and of testaments 28,840 ; making in the whole 60,439, which, added to those issued in preceding years, amounts to 309,062 bibles, testaments, and parts of testaments, that have been issued by the American Bible Society, during the eight years of its existence. Forty two auxiliaries have been added during the past year, making the whole number



404. 14,729 bibles and testaments have been issued gratuitously to auxiliary societies.

Great advantage has arisen to the Society, from the building for the transaction of the mechanical and other business operations. Stereotype plates have been procured for a testament of a larger size than common; plates have also been procured for the Bible in the Spanish language.

*Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, Piety, and Charity.*—This Society held its anniversary meeting, and attended public religious services on the day preceding the general election, at the church in Chauncy Place. The discourse was delivered by Rev. Mr. Colman, from Phil. i. 18. after which, \$38 52 were collected in aid of the funds. The Treasurer, Elisha Clapp, Esq. presented his Annual Report, from which it appears, that the funds of the Society in productive stock amount to the sum of \$1039 66. By a vote passed three years since, its operations were suspended until the funds should amount to \$1000. That point being now attained, the Society proposes without delay to resume its labours.

*The Ministerial Conference in Berry Street* was holden on the morning of Election Day, at the vestry of the church in Federal street. Rev. Dr. Bancroft was chosen Moderator, and Rev. Mr. Ware, Scribe. Rev. Drs. Harris, Porter, and Lowell were appointed on the standing Committee for the ensuing year.

Rev. Dr. Parker, of Portsmouth, N. H. delivered an address on the duties of the church as distinct from the congregation, and the advantages which might result from using it as an association for religious and benevolent exertion.

The report of a committee on the subject of tracts was referred to the next year. An elaborate report on the subject of a commentary on the Scriptures was referred to a committee of fifteen, to be disposed of at their pleasure.

*Convention of Congregational Ministers.*—The business of this year's Convention was transacted with great unanimity. Rev. Mr. Packard, of Shelburne, was chosen second preacher. A committee appointed to consider 'whether any thing, and, if any thing, what, can be done by this Convention, for the more devout sanctification of the Lord's day,' made a report which was accepted, referring all such attempts to the conscientious concern of every Christian minister to do his duty in this particular, according to his best discretion. Rev. Mr. Snell, of North Brookfield, delivered the annual discourse from Jeremiah, xxiii. 28, 29. after which a collection was taken of \$326 93. The sermon was a Calvinistick enforcement of the manner in which ministers ought to preach, written and delivered in a spirit of moderation. Some, however, intimated that more

was evidently intended by it than met the ear; and that hence it was a violation, on the preacher's own principles, of the direction in the text, 'he, that hath my word, let him *speak* my word *faithfully*.'

*Massachusetts Evangelical Missionary Society.*—The annual meeting of this Society was holden in the vestry of the church in Federal street, Boston, on the afternoon of Election Day. The trustees made a report, which will be found below. A sermon, from 2 Thess. iii. 1. was delivered before the Society in the evening, in Rev. Dr. Channing's church, by Rev. Mr. Bayley of Pelham. The assembly was the most numerous, which we recollect to have seen, at any time, on such an occasion. It was, indeed, highly gratifying to the friends of the Society to witness such a full meeting. The discourse was very creditable to the talents and spirit of the preacher. It was ingenious, catholic, and impressive. The collections amounted to \$288 70. The number of Missionaries employed, and of settled ministers assisted, is twelve; and the sum appropriated for the present year is \$950. No individual receives more than \$150; some receive \$100; and some \$50. We are happy to learn, that the members of this Society have increased during the past year. As its claims are better known, we think it will receive ample support from enlightened and benevolent Christians. That there is important aid afforded to the cause of rational and evangelical piety, by the present efforts of the Trustees and Executive Committee, we have abundant proof.

*Present Officers of the Society.*

Hon. Chief Justice Parker, President.

Rev. Dr. Bancroft, Vice President.

Alden Bradford, Esq. Secretary.

Benjamin Guild, Esq. Treasurer.

Mr. David Reed, and } Assistant Treasurers.  
Ichabod Tucker, Esq. }

*Trustees.*—Rev. Drs. Bancroft, Foster, Thayer, Lowell, and Peirce; Rev. Messrs. Kendall, Parkman, Ripley and Ware; S. Higginson, Alden Bradford, I. Tucker, and Lewis Tappan, Esqrs.

*Executive Committee.*—Rev. Dr. Lowell, Rev. Mr. Parkman, S. Higginson, A. Bradford, and B. Guild, Esqrs.

*Recent Donations.*

Collection in May	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$288 70
Friend in Taunton, by Rev. Mr. Clark	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 00
Do. not present	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 00
Do. do	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 00
Do. by Rev. Dr. Nichols	-	-	-	-	-	-	20 00
Do. by S. Higginson, Esq.	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 00
Lady of Salem	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 00

Friend in Eastham, by Rev. Mr. Shaw	-	-	-	2	00
Life Subscription by Rev. Mr. Walker	-	-	-	30	00
From Annual Subscribers	-	-	-	22	00

*Report of Trustees.*—‘As it is only six months since a report was made to the Society, of the proceedings of the Executive Committee for the preceding year,\* a particular statement will not now probably be expected. But the Trustees are unwilling to permit this occasion to pass without observing, that applications for assistance are increasing; that there is a happy prospect of extending the sphere and usefulness of the Society; and that we have every reason to persevere in the course hitherto pursued.

‘Since our last meeting several new applications have been made for assistance, from destitute societies, and from others who need our bounty to enable them to support their religious teachers. Those of the latter description are the most numerous. As a necessary consequence of the great diversity of religious sentiments, which exists and is prevailing in the state, the clergy in many places are left without sufficient support, although no fault is chargeable on them, and they are still faithfully labouring in the cause of the Gospel.

‘We may regret this state of things; and yet it seems to be unavoidable, where there is perfect religious freedom of opinion. The only rational and Christian method of checking the prevalence of erroneous doctrines, is by encouraging the settlement, and assisting in the support of learned, prudent, and zealous ministers. Where the clergy are able to teach, and to convince gainsayers, and are exemplary, diligent, and faithful, there, we may justly hope, divisions and dangerous errors will not exist. It becomes the duty of intelligent Christians to aid in the establishment and maintenance of such teachers.

‘The prevalence of the modern sect of Universalists, who deny the doctrine of a future retribution, and who do not consider a pious and holy life essential to happiness hereafter, is particularly alarming, and calls for the special notice of all serious Christians. We think this system to be most injurious to the interests of good morals, and to the welfare of civil society, as well as fatally dangerous to the souls of men. And we believe it directly contrary to the plainest declarations of the holy Gospel. How is it to be opposed? The weapons of our warfare are not carnal but spiritual. There are already extant many able treatises, exposing the errors and dangers of this system; but they are read by a few only. The only extensive prevention or antidote, we think, will be found in a learned and pious ministry. It is the laudable design of this Socie-

\* The Annual Meeting, which was formerly in October, has been changed to the last Wednesday of May.



ty, to be kept constantly in view, to assist in the support and furtherance of an object, so justly dear to our ancestors, and from which has hitherto resulted so much good to individuals and to society. We would encourage and patronize those who make the word of God their rule and guide, and who teach the pure and simple doctrines of the Gospel.

‘It is our happiness to reflect, that several clergymen of the above character have been settled or continued through the bounty of this Society. Your Christian liberality has been gratefully received; and the blessing of many ready to perish is your rich reward. We have also reason to believe, that dangerous errors have been prevented from spreading in many places, by the able instructions and exemplary conduct of those we have employed or assisted. And we have a well founded hope of more extensive usefulness. Liberal patrons of the Society are increasing, and a greater interest is felt in our behalf, by the intelligent and pious, on learning the objects and design of our labours. It remains for us to be active and faithful in the cause we have in view. Great good is not to be effected, but by zealous and persevering efforts. If these be in a good degree proportionate to the importance of the cause in which we are engaged, and such as the probable benefits to be expected require of us, we may reasonably hope to be instrumental in promoting the present and eternal welfare of many of our fellow-men.’

*The Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance* held its annual meeting on Friday, May 28, at the vestry of the church in Chauncy place. The following persons were elected officers of the Society for the ensuing year.

Hon. Chief Justice Parker, President.

Rev. Dr. Porter,	} Vice Presidents.
Hon. W. Prescott,	
Rev. W. Jenks.	

*Council.*

Hon. Nathan Dane,	Rev. William Collier,
Professor Hedge,	Rev. Henry Ware, jr.
Rev. Abiel Abbot, D. D.	Hon. Francis C. Gray,
Rev. Charles Lowell, D. D.	Lewis Tappan, Esq.

Dr. John Ware, Secretary and Treasurer.

No address was delivered before the Society the present year.

*Massachusetts Bible Society.*—The sixteenth anniversary meeting of this Society was holden June 3, at the first church, Boston. Rev. Mr. Gray of Roxbury preached the annual discourse from Psalms, xix. 10. The collection amounted to \$124 29. The officers of the preceding year were reelected. From the report of the Executive Committee it appears, that during the last year the

Society has received 50 large, and 997 small Bibles, and 1164 Testaments ; and distributed 91 large and 1325 small Bibles, and 1384 Testaments. Since its formation it has distributed 2218 large, and 18,083 small Bibles, and 13,401 Testaments. The amount received during the last year, from donations, subscriptions, and the annual collection was \$1374 51, besides \$112 20 from the sale of Bibles ; and the amount expended \$1854 57. The number of subscribers has considerably decreased. The Committee recommend that instead of a gratuitous distribution of the Scriptures, the Society should take measures for disposing of them, for the whole or part of their cost.

*Publishing Fund.*—The subscribers to this institution held their annual meeting on Tuesday evening June 22, at the house of Mr. J. S. Foster. The following Report of the Secretary was read ;

‘Three years have elapsed since the first organization of this Society ; and before we proceed to another election of officers, a plain statement of past transactions is due, particularly as our proceedings have been unusually silent and unobtrusive, and the last anniversary passed without a meeting, in consequence of the absence of the Secretary, on a tour for his health.

‘The Society was organized in June, 1821, and the funds arising from subscriptions amounted, in October following, to about one thousand dollars ; which, together with subsequent receipts, have been expended in the publication of tracts, and these have been placed in the hands of agents for sale. Our emissions to November, 1821, amounted to 28,000 copies of moral and religious tracts, which were favourably received. We then printed *A Sequel to Frank in Easy Lessons*, not being sufficiently aware that works of this size would require more capital than could be conveniently spared for such an object. We relied on the excellence of the book, and the fame of the author, to improve our funds by the profit of its sales ; but we were disappointed by a rival edition, which involved us in a debt nearly equal to our capital, and our operations for the two subsequent years were on this account embarrassed.

‘This time, however, though it produced little of novelty, did not pass unimproved. Liberal sales were effected of old tracts and half the edition of *Frank* was disposed of at a loss of about one hundred and fifty dollars ; and in November, 1823, we found ourselves again out of debt, and free to pursue our original design, which has since been adhered to. Our ignorance of the business involved us in another difficulty. The system of sales by agents, at first adopted, is found to be complicated, and to require more time and attention, than could be reasonably claimed from any member of our board. We have therefore determined, in future, to rely more on direct sales, and less on consignments ; a plan in which Messrs. Richard-



son & Lord, our present general agents, are effectually cooperating.

‘When these disadvantages, and the small amount of our manageable property are considered, we may appear not to have been negligent of our trust.

‘We have at present \$1499 31 invested in tracts and books at cost, for sale in agents’ hands, per statement No. 1. and \$69 17 balance of accounts in our favour, per statement No. 2, forming a trading capital of \$1568 48, which can be turned so as to allow a steady succession to tracts, if judiciously selected, without again appealing to the charitable feelings of the publick for contributions. If that publick will encourage us, by purchasing valuable books at a cheap rate, it is all we ask. We have printed in all, eighteen books, averaging about eighty pages each, and making a total of 48,000 copies, per statement No. 3, being nearly equal to 200,000 tracts of twenty pages each, which is a greater number than has been issued by most tract societies. I go into this calculation only to show, that we have done more than would at first appear by a bare statement of numbers; and that, if directed by past experience, we keep to our present plan of printing small and interesting tracts, we may in a few years occupy no narrow field of usefulness. Our sales already realised amount to 21,004 copies, exclusive of a large number which we know to have been sold, but yet wait returns from, per statement No. 4. This includes a small amount taken in exchange by order of the Trustees. We have realised from these sales, after defraying all expenses, a nett profit of \$90 26,\* which now forms part of our capital.

‘One of our tracts is a third time in press. Others have had and many require, a second edition.

‘On the whole, notwithstanding our mistakes, and the small amount of our capital, I am convinced that the Society is now in a prosperous state; that its publications may safely be expected to yield a fair profit, affording ultimately as much capital as we can use to advantage; and that it will continue, if managed with prudence and perseverance, to be an increasing source of usefulness to the community. From annual subscribers, therefore, we do not think it advisable to claim the charity they have pledged; but our usefulness would be much increased, if subscriptions could be procured for a series of tracts, which would enable us to print larger editions, and secure them a more general circulation.

‘It may be said that the publick are already supplied with books of every kind, that the press teems daily with new works, and that ours are labours of supererogation. We answer, such is the motley mixture, that it is a task of no small difficulty, to select from

\* This added to the loss on Frank would make about \$250.



this mass the mental and moral nutriment, which, as parents and friends, as masters and neighbours, we wish to furnish to those, who look to us for supplies, or would be benefited by our extending them; and the time and talents for this scrutiny are possessed by few. Busied as are a large portion of our citizens in their daily avocations, they must rely on the judgment of others, or read much trash for the sake of a little valuable matter. Good tracts are particularly scarce, and mostly tinctured with the doctrines of men; and writings of this class possess an influence over the community, second only to the 'lively oracles,' which they profess to explain and support. Who that has noticed the universal diffusion through christendom, of the 'Pilgrim's Progress,' the 'Shepherd of Salisbury Plain,' the 'Dairyman's Daughter,' and other popular tracts, which might be named, can doubt of the strong hold they have on the publick taste, and the importance of meeting the demand with such as are chaste in their style, and elevated in their moral and religious principles? To supply the want of such publications, and to provide a succession, which should unite entertainment and utility, and save the distributing publick from the labour of previous examination, by the sanction of a judicious selecting committee, was the object of our association. If that object has been but partially attained, it is attributable to our want of experience, and not to our want of opportunity. The style of printing and binding of our tracts secures them a respectable place in the residence of the affluent, and at the same time enables us to afford them at a cheap rate. They are neither so large as to startle the young, nor so small as to seem like childrens' books to the old. A considerable portion is of the narrative kind, but such tracts are the most popular, they sell best, and are read by the light and young, on whose amusements it is well if we can engraft the scion of virtue and religion.

'Tracts of an argumentative and didactick kind are mostly preferred by those, whose religious characters are formed, or whose bias at least is decidedly good, and they may render much service to the common cause; but when a parent assembles his children around him in an evening, the circle will be strongly impressed by the moral conveyed in an engaging story, when the same sentiment divested of the interest of the fable, would be listened to without interest, and soon forgotten. A similar effect is produced among the labouring classes of the community generally, and persons accustomed to abstract reasoning are not always aware how irksome it is to the multitude at large. It is vain to attribute this to bad taste; we must take the world as it is, and adapt our efforts for its improvement to the present state of society, not forgetting to take into view its levity and love of novelty. These are our reasons for past selections, and our motives for wishing to pursue the same plan in future.

I will add, that we need only perseverance in our present course, and a reasonable patronage from the publick, to insure all the success we at first anticipated.

JOHN S. FOSTER,

*Sec. Publishing Fund.*

The following gentlemen were elected to compose the government of the Society for the next year.

John S. Foster, Secretary.

George Bond, Treasurer.

Rev. James Walker,

Prof. George Ticknor, and } Publishing Committee.

Rev. John G. Palfrey.

*New Church in Boston.*—On Monday, May 10, at 10 o'clock, the corner stone of the new Church on Chambers Street, was laid with the usual ceremonies.

A short but very appropriate Address was first made to those assembled, by George Bond, Esq. the chairman of the building committee. This was followed by an excellent Address and a very fervent and appropriate Prayer by the Rev. Dr. Lowell.

The whole ceremony was closed by a few impressive remarks by Dr. Lowell, and the company then withdrew.

It seems proper in this place to state that the church now erecting is not commenced on account of any schism in any of the present Congregational churches, or any disaffection in any of the people towards their pastors, but purely from the crowded state of the churches, and the impossibility of furnishing accommodations for all who wish to attend these churches. A number of the gentlemen, whose names are on the list of the building committee, probably a majority of them, will not leave their present places of worship. They have engaged in this undertaking only with the benevolent wish to aid in providing suitable accommodations for worship for the increasing population of the city, and particularly for the very flourishing part of it where the Church is situated.—*Christian Register.*

*Church in Deerfield.*—The corner stone of a meeting house, for the first Congregational Society in Deerfield, was laid on Tuesday, June 1. The religious services were introduced with prayer by Rev. Mr. Willard. The corner stone was then laid in the usual manner. Under it was deposited a silver plate, enclosed in a leaden box, and bearing the following inscription.

ERECTED FOR THE SOCIAL WORSHIP OF THE ONE TRUE GOD,  
THROUGH JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD, IN CHARITY WITH ALL CHRIS-  
TIAN.

After an address by Rev. Mr. Willard, prayers were offered by Rev. Mr. Field; and the services were concluded by singing an occasional hymn, composed by Mr. Willard.



Our limits do not permit us to insert the Address entire. No one can fail to be struck with the good sense and good spirit of the following remarks, which we extract from it.

‘ I must regard *him*, as the most devoted servant and friend of Christ, who labours most for the promotion of peace and good understanding among his disciples ; and *him*, on the contrary, as *least* entitled to the name of friend, who sows discord or suspicion among brethren, or carelessly indulges in such modes of administration, as might justly be expected to wound, or grieve any one, “for whom Christ died.” In saying this, however, I do not say that *doctrines* are not sometimes to be *preached* or *defended*, which may be at variance with the faith of some sincere disciples of Jesus. In some cases this may be an indispensable duty ; and where it is so, no one, it is evident, can justly esteem it a grievance. We are all to go to Christ for instruction ; to hear for ourselves ; to interpret for ourselves ; not to receive implicitly the interpretation of any *fellow disciple*, whatever his *rank* or pretension. If our apprehensions of the doctrine of Christ in any particular, differ from those of our neighbour, we do not forfeit the Christian character by endeavouring in the spirit of humility, meekness, and candour to convince him of his supposed error. On the contrary, it is the sacred duty of all, and especially of those, who are “set for the defence of the Gospel,” to use their best endeavours for the propagation of what they regard as important truth. In their exchanges one with another, Christian courtesy and prudence may generally, and perhaps always, furnish sufficient reasons for abstaining from every thing contradictory to the known, or supposed sentiments of those, in whose places they officiate ; and the grand object of every minister in his *own* pulpit should doubtless be to inculcate vital piety, benevolence, and purity. But, while he does this, he gives no just offence, if he occasionally presents his own peculiar views of Christian doctrine, with the reasons on which they are grounded. On the contrary, candour and frankness united would tend much to prevent misunderstandings, and to conciliate all ingenuous minds. In the exercises of *devotion*, in social *prayer* and *praise*, the case, I conceive, is essentially different. Here, it may be said, “Hast thou faith ?” (a faith different from thy neighbour) “have it to thyself before God.” In publick *worship* we have no right to any peculiarities ; since it is not the object of that worship to suggest matter of speculation for the consideration of our brethren, but to give them the most immediate and the most effectual aid in their joint addresses to our common Father. With these sentiments I feel no hesitation in pledging myself to all our brethren within the town, within the bounds of the Christian *world*, who may be disposed to unite permanently, or occasionally, in our worship, that, so long as it shall please God to continue my imperfect labours in the



house we are now building, I will endeavour to order all parts of worship in such a manner, as may tend most to unite, and edify, and comfort all hearts. If any of our brethren, whose lives adorn the Christian profession, but who from any cause have estranged themselves from us, are disposed to meet these advances, my heart is open, my arms are extended to their utmost length, to welcome their visits within the walls of the sanctuary, and at the table of the blessed Redeemer.

‘My sentiments in regard to the proper modes of conducting the worship of God’s house, are, I believe, in perfect harmony with those of my brethren, with whom I have the happiness of being associated in the labours of the pulpit. Of course the pledge I give for myself, I am perhaps warranted in giving for them. It is an established principle with us, that, when we address our God in the name and behalf of our fellow Christians, we have no right to offer any sentiments, or use any expression, in which, as we apprehend, they cannot cordially unite. Thence in regard to all those subjects, which have unhappily divided the Christian church, we feel ourselves bound, so far as we introduce them at all, to confine ourselves to the language of Scripture ; to borrow our devotions both in spirit and form from the patriarchs and prophets, from Christ and his Apostles ; in all cases giving a devout preference to the “ words which the holy spirit teacheth,” and not those, “ which man’s wisdom teacheth.”’

*Church in Hallowell.*—The frame of the first Unitarian Church in Hallowell, Maine, was erected June 9. We are informed that the Society expect to occupy it in September.

---

### **LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.**

- Hints on Missions. By James Douglas, Esq. First American Edition, considerably improved and enlarged, with Notes, &c. by the American Editors.
- The Greek Revolution, an Address delivered in Park Street Church, Boston, on Thursday, April 1, and repeated at the request of the Greek Committee in the Old South Church, on the Evening of April 14, 1824. By Sereno E. Dwight, Pastor of Park Street Church. Second Edition. S. T. Armstrong.
- Sermons to Children. By Rev. Samuel Nott, jr.
- Theology Explained and Defended in a Series of Sermons. By Timothy Dwight, S. T. D. LL. D. late President of Yale College. Third Edition.
- Old Hundred Collection of Sacred Musick, or a Compilation of the most approved Psalmody, selected from various Authors, for the

- use of publick and social Worship. By Individuals of different religious Societies in Boston. Ezra Lincoln.
- Moral Dignity of the Missionary Enterprise; a Sermon, by F. Wayland, jr. Third Edition.
- A Sermon on the Manifestation of God; founded on 1 Timothy, iii. 16. By Joseph Richardson, Minister of the first Parish in Hingham.
- First Annual Report of the American Society for promoting the Civilization and general Improvement of the Indian Tribes in the United States.
- Boston Handel and Haydn Collection of Church Musick. A new Edition. Richardson & Lord.
- The Recollections of Jotham Anderson, Minister of the Gospel. Boston. David Reed.
- Christian Observer for January.
- A Catechism, by Thomas Baldwin, D. D. being a Compendium of Christian Doctrine and Practice. Boston. Lincoln & Edmands.
- Sermons preached in St. John's Church, Glasgow. By Thomas Chalmers, Minister of St. John's Church. 12mo. Philadelphia.
- Gospel Advocate. Vol. VI. Nos. 3 and 4.
- Missionary Herald. Vol. XX. Nos. 5 and 6.
- Christian Spectator. Vol. VI. Nos. 5 and 6.
- A Collection of Essays and Tracts in Theology. By Jared Sparks. No. VI. Containing Biographical Notice; Remarks on the Writings of Dr. Cogan; Letters to Wilberforce on the Doctrine of Hereditary Depravity.
- The Friend of Peace. No. XII. Vol. 3.
- Unitarian Miscellany. Nos. 41 and 42.
- A Discourse pronounced before His Excellency William Eustis, the Honourable Council, and the two Houses, composing the Legislature of Massachusetts, May 26, 1824, being the Anniversary Election. By Daniel Sharp, Pastor of the third Baptist Church in Boston. Second Edition.
- Sermons by the late Rev. David Osgood, D. D. Pastor of the Church in Medford. 1 Vol. 8vo.
- Stories Explanatory of the Church Catechism. By Mrs. Sherwood, Author of several popular Works for Children. Burlington, N. J.
- The Four Gospels of the New Testament in Greek, from the Text of Griesbach, with a Lexicon in English of all the Words contained in them; designed for the Use of Schools. Boston. Cummings & Hilliard.
- Seventeen Discourses on Several Texts of Scripture; addressed to Christian Assemblies in Villages near Cambridge. To which are added Six Morning Exercises. By Robert Robinson. First American Edition.

The Monitor, designed to improve the Taste, the Understanding, and the Heart. No. 4, for June.

Essays to do Good; addressed to all Christians; whether in public or private Capacities. By the late Cotton Mather, D. D. F. R. S. A new Edition, improved by George Burder. From the latest London Edition. 12mo.

A Selection of Hymns and Psalms, for social and private Worship. Second Edition, enlarged and improved. Boston.

Baptist Magazine, for May.

Short Missionary Discourses, or Monthly Concert Lectures. By Enoch Pond, A. M. Pastor of the Church in Ward, Mass.

Regular Hymns, on a great Variety of Evangelical Subjects and Important Occasions; with Musical Directions, for all the Varieties of appropriate Expression. By Samuel Willard, Minister of the first Church in Deerfield. Boston. Richardson & Lord.

A Pronouncing Testament, for the Use of Schools. A New Edition, stereotyped.

Sunday School Gleanings; containing brief Memoirs and Interesting Anecdotes of Sunday School Children. By a Sunday School Teacher.

The Light of Truth in the Mind of Man, the only Rule of Faith and Practice; with some Observations upon the Formality and Idolatry of Religious Sects. Philadelphia.

A Plea for Ministerial Liberty; a Discourse delivered by Appointment, to the Directors and Students of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church at Princeton, May 17, 1824. By John M. Duncan, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Tammany Street, Baltimore. Cushing & Jewett.

Salvation by Christ; to which is added Remarks upon the Nature of Salvation by Christ, shewing that it is a Birth of Divine Life in Man, known long before the Appearance of our Lord in that Body that was born of the Virgin Mary, in which he did the Father's Will, and exemplified and displayed the Way and Work of Salvation, as a Union of God and Man; a Work of God in Man, and of Man by God, in a blessed Harmony and Cooperation. By that faithful Servant and Minister of Christ, Job Scott. Philadelphia. Emmor Kimber.

Remarks on Ministerial Exchanges. Boston. David Reed.

The Ministry of the Word committed to Faithful and Able Men; a Sermon preached at Middlebury, Vermont, on the fourth Anniversary of the North Western Branch of the American Education Society, January 14, 1824. By Absalom Peters, A. M. Pastor of the Congregational Church in Bennington. Published by the Society.

The Dying Believer committing his Soul to Christ; a Sermon on the death of Mrs. Cynthia Fairchild, who died at East Hartford,



February 22, 1824, in the the 35th year of her age. By Thomas Robbins, Minister in East Windsor. Hartford.

An Inaugural Discourse, delivered on the 1st of January, 1824.

By John H. Rice, Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological Seminary in Virginia. Richmond.

Seventh Annual Report of the American Society for Colonizing the Free People of Colour of the United States. With an Appendix. Washington. Davis & Force.

For the Trustees of the Publishing Fund.

Devotional Exercises for the Use of Young Persons; containing Reflections, and a Prayer for each Morning and Evening in the Week. By Charles Wellbeloved. Second American Edition.

#### INSTALLED.

April 27, Rev. Prince Hawes, over the Evangelical Congregational Church, in South Boston.—June 23, Rev. Joseph B. Felt, over a church in Hamilton.

#### ORDAINED.

April 10, Rev. Rufus W. Bailey, over the church in Pittsfield.—April 21, Rev. Moses Partridge, over the second church in Plymouth.—April 28, Rev. Alexander Phœnix, over the second church in Springfield.—May 9, Rev. Benjamin Woodbury, over the first church in Falmouth.—June 16, Rev. Sumner Lincoln, over the church in Gardner.

#### DIED.

In Boston, June 11, Samuel Parkman, Esq. aged 72 years; one of the most distinguished and eminent merchants; who raised himself to great opulence by his own industrious exertions, without losing any thing of the moderation and simplicity of his original character and manners, or his strong attachment to the retired habits of domestick life. He was peculiarly domestic in his feelings, devoted to his family and friends, and singularly successful in the difficult duty of family government and discipline. Affectionate and yet firm, by a judicious mixture of decision and kindness, he acquired and maintained to the last an unusually powerful influence with a numerous and most attached family. To them the loss of his counsels and affection is irreparable. He had been a professor of Christianity forty three years, and deacon in the second church twenty three years. To the interests of that church he was zealously devoted, and gave frequent proofs of his attachment by personal service and aid, which will long be remembered with gratitude. His last disease was sudden and painful. When informed that it must be fatal, he received the intelligence with perfect composure, and acquiesced without a murmur in the appointment of Heaven. Desirable as life continued to be, and to few was it more so, he yet surrendered it at once. He spoke with humility of his imperfections and unworthiness, and offered a fervent prayer that they might be forgiven, and that his sincere attempts to do his duty might be accepted; declaring his trust to be in the mercy of God through Jesus Christ. His death was thus consistent with his profession, and brought consolation with it to his friends.

#### TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

Several interesting articles of intelligence are unavoidably omitted E. is under consideration.